A Historical Analysis of the Beavercreek Public Transportation Controversy

Research Thesis

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation *with research distinction* in History in the undergraduate colleges of The Ohio State University

By

Micah L. F. Maani

The Ohio State University
December 2017

Project Advisor: Professor Clayton C. Howard, Department of History

Introduction

Between 2010 and 2014, the suburban community of Beavercreek, Ohio made national headlines when Beavercreek City Council continually denied the Greater Dayton Transit Authority (RTA) permission to install bus stops at The Mall at Fairfield Commons. Dayton-based civil rights group Leaders for Equality & Action (LEAD) filed an allegation with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Office of Civil Rights stating Beavercreek City Council's refusal to allow public transportation into the suburb had a desperate socioeconomic impact on RTA's majority-minority ridership. The FHWA Office of Civil Rights quickly brought a federal lawsuit against the City of Beavercreek as they violated Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by barring black Daytonians from reaching the suburb along federally funded highways. Therefore, the FHWA threatened to halt all highway funding to the City of Beavercreek, forcing the suburb to open bus stops at the The Mall at Fairfield Commons in 2014. The Beavercreek case marked the first time the FHWA found a municipality to be using federal funding in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.[1]

This controversy in Beavercreek had its immediate causes, but it also resulted from nineteenth century industrialization, which brought about new means of transportation, discriminatory New Deal housing policies beginning in the Great Depression, and the affordability of homeownership along with automobiles after the Second World War. To many Americans, Beavercreek City Council's defense against RTA's proposal seemed like a logical reaction: white suburbanites use automobiles while black inner-city residents use public transportation. More importantly, Americans often view the layout of metropolitan America –

[1] *Free To Ride*, directed by Mathew Martin (2016; The Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity), Vimeo.

ubiquitous with black urban cores surrounded by all-white suburbs, homeownership, and automobiles as the primary means of transportation – as the standard way all cities are structured.

Furthermore, it is often believed that American cities have always been racially segregated, despite suburbanization having only begun in the late-nineteenth century. This misperception of American cities ignores the historical realities in New Deal Era housing policies under the Home Owners' Loan Corporation (HOLC) and the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) promoted suburban homeownership and racial segregation over older and heterogeneous neighborhoods. The construction of the Interstate Highway System solidified postwar development, making automobiles the only way to reach developing suburbs like Beavercreek. This helped cause streetcar companies to go out of business, ending the era of mass-transit in America. Additionally, this helped to relocate business and industry around interstates, increasingly inaccessible to low-income Daytonians who could not afford an automobile.

During late-1960s, urban riots occurred throughout American cities as blacks protested their socioeconomic conditions, including Dayton in 1966. Many suburbanites blamed the result of the immoral and meritless culture of black Americans, as well as planned antagonisms by Black Power leaders. However, several factors in addition to housing discrimination perpetuated the Dayton Riot of 1966, including urban renewal, police brutality, and the failure of Dayton-based War on Poverty agencies. The Dayton riots helped rationalize the transition from commuting to Dayton's central business district to suburban malls, where it was believed to be safer due to a segregated atmosphere.

Urban historians argue that the form suburbanization has taken in the United States represents the cultural values embodied in the rural dethatched home, which Americans have

celebrated over other forms of dwellings. Kenneth T. Jackson in *Crabgrass Frontier* argues that the segregated and sprawled nature of US cities is largely a cultural phenomenon of the United States – unlike most of the world – because many Americans have romanticized pastoral landscapes and because suburbs in this country developed around new forms of transportation, discriminatory housing policies, as well as cheaply mass-produced detached homes.[2] Many white suburbanites today idealize the image of 1950s suburbia as the only viable residential option. In *Building the Dream*, Gwendolyn Wright argues that despite many white suburbanites having largely monolithic housing ideals, Americans have long occupied and idealized various forms of dwellings other than 1950s suburban homes. Moreover, Wright contends that many whites romanticize this era as having had no racial problems while simultaneously providing a safe haven for whites against the racial and socioeconomic problems of cities.[3]

The history of suburbanization in the United States provides context for the recent transportation controversy in Beavercreek. While many Beavercreek residents idealize the image of 1950s suburbia, believing it is natural for their community to be racial segregated and lack public transportation, this notion ignores the diverse housing history in Dayton. More importantly, it ignores the fact that the detached suburban home was not always the American ideal.

Suburbanization began in Dayton in the late-nineteenth century due to the advent of the streetcar which allowed wealthy industrialists of the National Cash Register Corporation (NCR) to move the streetcar suburb of Oakwood. Urban blight and pollution in addition to growing

---

[2] Kenneth T. Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States* (New York City, NY: Oxford University Press, 1985), 3-11.
[3] Gwendolyn Wright, *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America* (New York City, NY: Pantheon Books, 1981), xv-xix.

black and immigrant populations caused wealthy whites to build mansions and summer estates in Oakwood in an effort to live aristocratic lifestyles distinguished from the working-class. The Victorian Era ideal during the turn of the nineteenth century in Dayton was only accessible to upper-class whites with restrictive covenants barring most minorities. Homeownership, furthermore, was extremely expensive and only those wealthy enough to pay their mortgages in-full could purchase homes. After the Dayton Flood of 1913 and during the Great Depression, Dayton experienced an acute housing crisis, causing many Daytonians to live in a variety of housing forms from temporary units to urban apartments.

Almost seventy years before the controversy in Beavercreek, the Second World War fundamentally altered the course of suburbanization in Dayton as the federal government funded the development of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base (WPAFB), which became Montgomery County's largest employer, causing eastward trajectory of suburbanization. The HOLC and the FHA subsidized low-interest mortgages on suburban homes in an effort to relieve the housing crisis while simultaneously enforcing racial segregation. Through FHA subsidization and new means of mass-production, entrepreneurs in Dayton including Charles H. Huber built new mass-produced suburban communities. While racial segregation was an important factor for many white Daytonians, the mass-produce home became commonplace during the Postwar Era due to the fact that suburban homeownership was frequently the more affordable than urban renting.

Furthermore, as automobiles became more affordable and suburbs developed around roadways, it brought an end to the need for public transportation in suburban development. This caused largest segments of the white middle-class and businesses to relocate around suburban interstates rather than railroads, which diminished Dayton's tax base, furthered urban blight, created failing public schools, and lowered employment opportunities. This worsening of the

socioeconomic problems in cities like Dayton due to suburbanization only reinforced notions whites held about blacks and the urban core. Therefore, in an effort to attract revenue back to America's central business districts, the Housing Act of 1949 allowed investors to conduct urban renewal projects. Many of these projects bulldozed black neighborhoods. A combination of real estate discrimination, FHA policies, and urban redevelopment worked together to segregate West Dayton.

By the late-1960s, as suburbanization and urban renewal unfolded, numerous black Daytonians saw firsthand how the Civil Rights Movement limited success in the North as most Dayton businesses still followed an unspoken rule of racial segregation which not only barred blacks from swimming pools and restaurants, but from employment opportunities as well. The Civil Rights Movement helped bring about new legislation including the War on Poverty, establishing and funding agencies in an attempt to address the socioeconomic problems within black neighborhoods. Both founded in the mid-1960s, Supporting Committee on Preventative Effort (SCOPE) and Moving Ahead Together (MAT) were Dayton's two primary civil rights organizations which received federal funding for the War on Poverty. Although, bureaucratic and inter-organizational disagreements over federal funding within SCOPE and MAT caused the organizations to be ineffective, disillusioning many within Dayton's black community towards federal civil rights programs.

The inability of organizations like SCOPE and MAT, however, to end systemic housing and employment discrimination against blacks helped spark the Dayton Riot of 1966. Many African Americans throughout the United States held similar sentiments which brought about nationwide riots from Watts, California in 1965 to Newark, New Jersey in 1967. Although the unprovoked murder of a black man named Lester Mitchell by a white man ignited the Dayton

Riot of 1966, long-held animosities and grievances towards the conditions on the black Westside fueled the Dayton riot. Dayton newspapers over-reported on black youths looting white-owned stores as well as attacking white motorists. Suburbs protected their shared borders with the City of Dayton by barring public transportation in order to protect whites from black Westside residents using public transportation.

The destruction and looting which occurred during the Dayton Riot of 1966 motivated businesses to relocate from downtown while simultaneously helping to cause whites to frequent suburban malls. Many whites feared taking their families downtown after the riots and appreciated the segregated atmospheres of suburban stores. Developers built malls around interstate highway corridors which made malls practical for the automobile owners but almost inaccessible for urbanites reliant on public transportation. The Salem Mall opened in Dayton in 1966 followed by the Dayton Mall in suburban Miamisburg in 1970. Although, once the RTA provided public transportation to the Dayton Mall, white shoppers increasingly complained about black youth, and contributed to the shopping center's decline by associating black youth with criminal behavior.

At approximately the same time, suburban elites worked to preserve their independence. Beginning in 1964, the Committee of Eleven fought a sixteen-year legal battle for the municipal incorporation of Beavercreek Township as a means of preserving racially homogeneous schools out of fear their children would be corrupted by black youth they associated with the riots. The suburban communities of Beavercreek Township and Fairborn developed heavily after the Second World War due to the growth of WPAFB and the opening Wright State University (WSU). Therefore, when the already incorporated City of Fairborn proposed to annex Beavercreek Township in 1964, residents feared the working-class suburb of Fairborn would

bring black people and crime into their community. As a result, local elites established the Committee of Eleven to resist the City of Fairborn. Although the campaign for incorporation truly gained momentum in 1972 when the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) filed *Brinkman v. Gilligan* and requested a busing program for the desegregation of all schools in the Dayton Metropolitan Area. The primary goal of the Committee of Eleven quickly became not only protecting their community from Fairborn, but from Dayton Public Schools, where parents believed criminal black youth would corrupt their children. The City of Beavercreek would not incorporate until 1980, yet it successfully avoided racial integration with Fairborn and Dayton.

As WPAFB and WSU rapidly developed in the late-twentieth century, Interstate 675 East (I-675) opened in 1987 allowing easier automobile access to Fairborn and Beavercreek. More importantly to the busing controversy, I-675 physically divided the suburbs of Fairborn and Beavercreek, helping to bar RTA ridership in Fairborn from entering Beavercreek. In 1993, The Mall at Fairfield Commons opened at the I-675 corridor in Beavercreek. With no RTA access to The Mall at Fairfield Commons, this implicitly assured many whites of a segregated atmosphere, helping to expedite the decline of the Dayton Mall. As deindustrialization continued in Dayton into the twenty-first century, The Mall at Fairfield Commons increasingly became a hub for employment in the Dayton area. Due to the fact that municipalities in the Miami Valley Region have to agree to join RTA, Beavercreek never welcomed public transportation from Dayton and consequentially forced urban residents to trek the dangerous non-pedestrian overpass across I-675 to reach their jobs at the mall.

Part I of this thesis critiques the monolithic view of many people hold of US cities and explores the various forms of housing and transportation idealized throughout Dayton's history.

It investigates how the advent of new means of transportation such as the streetcar and automobile encouraged the development of suburbs like Oakwood and Huber Heights in different eras, while simultaneously discriminatory housing policies promoted ownership of single family homes and segregated metropolitans. Part II examines how decades of housing discrimination confined large parts of Dayton's black population to the Westside while urban renewal, police brutality, and high unemployment perpetuated poor socioeconomic conditions in the neighborhood. This section explores the inter-organizational conflicts within SCOPE and MAT which prevented the organizations from conquering these urban problems. Their limited successes led to disillusionment which helped ignite the Dayton Riot of 1966. Part II also examines the attitudes white suburbanites subsequently developed after the riot which influenced their belief that segregation resulted from black culture and personal failures. Part III begins with the establishment of the Committee of Eleven in 1964 and details how they spent sixteen years fighting for incorporation in order to protect their business interests, low tax rates, and avoid school desegregation. Part III then compares the campaign for incorporation by the Committee of Eleven to the battle to bar public transportation by the Beavercreek City Council.

Part I

The Dayton Metropolitan Area is currently home to 800,909 residents, only 141,368 of whom live within Dayton's municipal boundaries, while the other 659,541 residents are sprawled throughout the suburbs.[1] Dayton's periphery primarily houses the white middle-class while the urban core is home to a high concentration of low-income minorities. To many Daytonians, this seems to be natural and the way cities in the United States have always been. Even in the 1960s, despite the fact that Beavercreek became a populated suburb after the Second World War, the Committee of Eleven argued for incorporation in an effort to preserve "historical Beavercreek."[2] However, since the late-nineteenth century, Daytonians have lived in different types of suburbs which reflected the housing policies and means of transportation at that time.

Although the arrangement of cities and suburbs may seem arbitrary to many Daytonians today, the arrangement of the metropolis grew out of three important historical trends. The first trend was the advent of the streetcar in the late-nineteenth century allowed for the Dayton suburb of Oakwood to develop. Wealthy industrialists developed Oakwood into an aristocratic suburb that freed them from the urban pollution and congestion, where the primary forms of housing were mansions and summer estates. New domestic ideologies designated the detached home as the white family's refuge from the crime, poverty, and vices brought on by overcrowding and blight in Dayton's urban core, which they contributed to inherent "immoralities" within black and immigrant communities. The second trend occurred during the Great Depression. The New Deal established the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the Federal Housing Administration,

---

[1] "Data USA: Search, Map, Compare, and Download US Data," *Data USA*, www.datausa.io

[2] "Fairborn proposes annex of Beavercreek twp. area," 1956-1980, MS-112, Series I: Administration, boxes 1-3, "Who What Why: Chapter 1," Wright State University archives, Fairborn, Ohio.

agencies which provided low-interest mortgages primarily for the construction of suburban detached homes. These federal agencies based real estate values on the age and demographics of neighborhoods, prioritizing new detached homes in all-white suburbs over older homes within the urban core. This effectively segregated residential areas and economically deprived central business districts. The third trend was the mass-produced suburbs along interstates after the Second World War. Charles H. Huber benefited from federal housing policies and the automobile by creating the mass-produced suburb of Huber Heights for working-class Daytonians. The affordability of homeownership after the New Deal coupled with the development of the Interstate Highway System helped further segregate Dayton and made Daytonians increasingly reliant on automobiles to reach peripheral jobs.

The density, walkability, location of upper-class residents, and distinction between urban and rural life defined American cities until the Industrial Revolution in the mid-nineteenth century. Prior to the Industrial Revolution, throughout the world, the only way to travel long distances was by horse or by foot. Therefore, most urban centers were small enough that most residents could cross them relatively easily on foot. During the seventeenth century, American cities such as Boston and Philadelphia, for example, never extended over 1 mile in radius from their city centers.[3] Because walkability was central to preindustrial American cities, the wealthiest residents lived closest to the city center as property values increased due to centrality. More importantly, unlike today, there was a clear distinction between urban and rural landscapes, as the edge of the city ended with countryside. Additionally, extended families lived together and tended to have their family businesses attached to their homes. While people of different socioeconomic statuses lived in separate neighborhoods, due to urban density, these

[3] Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 12-19.

neighborhoods bordered each other, causing people of diverse backgrounds to come in contact with one another.[4] These characteristics of "walking cities" defined the City of Dayton in the nineteenth century. In his Master's thesis *Transportation Revolution and the Development of Oakwood, Ohio, 1870-1930*, Kenneth D. Miller writes: "The intersection of Third and Main streets historically represented the commercial center of Dayton. A circle of only one mile radius, centered on that intersection, encompassed virtually the entire city of Dayton as it existed in 1869."[5]

Dayton only extended beyond its walking city borders once industrialization began in the mid-nineteenth century with the introduction of streetcars and canals. The completion of the Miami-and-Erie Canal 1845, in addition to the arrival of steam railroad in 1849, jumpstarted industrialization in Dayton.[6] The canal allowed for commodities manufactured in Dayton to travel south to New Orleans along the Ohio and Mississippi rivers while the Baltimore-and-Ohio and Pennsylvania Railroads connected Dayton to industrial hubs including New York City and Chicago.[7]

By the late-nineteenth century, already Dayton 25 percent of all Daytonians worked in manufacturing.[8] Dayton's population boomed as a direct result not only to the labor demand, but the city's ability to construct more housing along horsecar lines. In 1810, Dayton's only had 383 residents, but its population grew to 10,977 in 1850 upon industrialization and rose to 116,577 by

---

[4] Ibid, 12-19.
[5] Kenneth David Miller, "Transportation Revolution and the Development of Oakwood, Ohio, 1870-1930" (Master's thesis, Wright State University, 1998), 27.
[6] Ibid, 27.
[7] Ibid, 27.
[8] Bruce W. and Virginia Ronald, *The Lands Between the Miamis: A Bicentennial Celebration of the Dayton Area* (Landfall Press, 1996), 12-19.

1910.[9] As industrialization made many Daytonians wealthy, they began investing their wealth into new homes in communities built along streetcar lines. In 1869, investors established the Dayton Street Railway Company and built the city's first horse-drawn streetcar line traveling from West Third Avenue at Western Avenue to East Third Street at Findlay Street.[10] The advent of the horsecar allowed the suburb of Oakwood to develop into an aristocratic enclave, where the ideal homes consisted of mansions and summer estates.

The platting of Oakwood established the first upper-class suburb of Dayton. Before this point, wealthy Daytonians had to live in proximity to the neighborhoods of people of various socioeconomic backgrounds. The streetcar allowed wealthy whites to leave the dense confines of the city. In 1872, investors Isaac Haas, Patterson Mitchell, William Dixon, and Gabriel Harman platted over 78 acres of Van Buren Township southeast of Dayton.[11] Three years later, Gabriel Harman chartered the Oakwood Street Railway Company which extended horsecar service into Dayton's southeastern countryside for the development of Oakwood.[12]

Oakwood remained a sparsely populated weekend retreat for wealthy Daytonians until the electrification of the streetcar allowed cities across the United States suburbanize at previously unforeseen rates. In 1880, 70 percent of streetcars in the United States were horsecars, but by 1902, 97 percent of streetcars were electrified.[13] According to historian Gwendolyn Wright:

---

[9] United States Census Bureau, "Table 36. Ohio – Race and Hispanic Origin for Selected Large Cities and Other Places: Earliest Census to 1990," www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0076/OHtab.pdf
[10] "History," *Greater Dayton Regional Transit Authority*, www.i-riderta.org/about-rta/history
[11] Ibid.
[12] "Oakwood Historical Society Newsletter: Winter 2011," *The Oakwood Historical Society*, (2011) : 1, www.oakwoodhistory.org/downloads/ohsnewswinter2011.pdf
[13] Miller, "Transportation Revolution and the Development of Oakwood, Ohio, 1870-1930," 53.

> The suburbs of the 1870s had been contained by the public transportation networks of slow horsecars and infrequent, expensive railroads. Then a real revolution in public transportation occurred… to compete with the electric streetcars, railway services opened up more lines and reduced fares. Commuting was suddenly easier, faster, and less costly.[14]

In 1888, the first electric streetcar in Dayton arrived, and it was known as the White Line Street Railroad.[15] Railroad corporations quickly began extending electric streetcar lines into the countryside for the development of new neighborhoods, which the Cities quickly annexed to maintain municipal control and increase their tax base. Dayton annexed many early streetcar suburbs such as Dayton View, Miami City, and Patterson the early-1880s shortly after they were built.[16]

However, Oakwood avoided annexation when John H. Patterson threatened the City of Dayton with an ultimatum: allow Oakwood to municipally incorporate and provide improved streetcar access for NCR employees, or the company will relocate from Dayton.[17] Patterson founded the National Cash Register Corporation in 1884 and made Oakwood the home of Dayton's wealthiest residents, including his upper-management. This caused Dayton to back down from their intentions to annex Oakwood, in order to preserve NCR's presence in the urban core. Therefore, on June 3, 1907, thirty-six of Oakwood's leading businessmen signed and presented a petition for incorporation to the Board of Trustees of Van Buren Township. The township voted in favor of incorporation and Oakwood became a village on January 9, 1908.[18]

---

[14] Wright, *Building the Dream*, 104.
[15] Ibid, 49.
[16] Ronald and Ronald, *The Lands Between the Miamis: A Bicentennial Celebration of the Dayton Area*, 118-120.
[17] Miller, "Transportation Revolution and the Development of Oakwood, Ohio, 1870-1930," 84-85.
[18] Bruce W. and Virginia Ronald, *Oakwood: The Far Hills* (Reflections Press, 1983), 54.

The incorporation of Oakwood not only provided upper-class Daytonians with an enclave to invest their wealth through homeownership, but an aristocratic environment in which to seclude themselves with individuals of their strata. Kenneth T. Jackson remarks: "The American nouveaux riches embraced the notion of conspicuous consumption in the form of ornamental real estate and decided that the most fashionable way to display great wealth was to invest in a rural estate of appropriately grand dimensions."[19] Historians Rosalyn Baxandall and Elizabeth Ewen write that aristocratic lifestyles were a characteristic of early suburbs, specifically on Long Island, New York:

> The elites were determined no industrial development would mar their beaches, forests, hunting preserves, yachting, and county clubs. Class conflict might be an unavoidable by-product of the industries these men owned, but life on the North Shore would bear no evidence of the industrial turmoil that financed it. The North Shore let the industrial elites live out the fantasy of a leisured, preindustrial existence – albeit with all the modern conveniences money could buy.[20]

One can see these attitudes among early residents of Oakwood, according to the suburb's official history: "Recreation is an Oakwood tradition, too. John Patterson's Old Barn Club, in Hills and Dales, offered golf and tennis, concerts, dances, pool tables, playgrounds, wading pools, volleyball, dining, and even overnight stays – all for a nominal membership fee."[21] At the time, recreational activities were a luxury, used by the upper-class to distance themselves from the working-class.

Furthermore, many Daytonians believed the bucolic atmosphere of Oakwood raised healthier and more moral families because of its rural location free from urban congestion and

---

[19] Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 88.
[20] Rosalyn Baxandall and Elizabeth Ewen, *Picture Windows: How The Suburbs Happened*, (Basic Books, 2000), 6.
[21] The City of Oakwood, *Oakwood: From Acorn to Oak Tree: A centennial Celebration 2008*, (The City of Oakwood, 2008), 41.

slums. Gwendolyn Wright claims that "those who moved to the new suburbs were assured of an escape from the problems of poor health, social unrest, and vice associated with urban life" while "the private dwelling in a safe residential neighborhood" protected whites from urban problems.[22] Home developers in Oakwood advertised that one's domestic environment directly influences the familial morals. An advertisement for Oakwood's Schantz Park Plat from 1915 states that "Schantz Park is ideal for a home where the health and development of children is a factor. A child that grows up in a Schantz Park home has the advantage of pure air and clean sunshine, and the delights of flowers, trees and growing things. Great are the moral and physical benefits, to the little folk, of adequate playgrounds and scenic beauty."[23] In the late-nineteenth century, many sociologists argued that men were rugged and adept for the hardships of urban life, while women and children were delicate and belonged in the protective environment of a suburban home. According to Wright: "Victorian ideology perceived women and children as especially close to nature, much more so than men, who could withstand the hard demands of supposedly unnatural city life – provided they had their retreats in the suburbs."[24]

Many white Americans often associated urban blight, crime, and poverty with the growing minority populations following the Civil War. As Dayton industrialized, the city's black population grew from 305 blacks in 1860 to 3,387 in 1900 primarily due African American migration from the south.[25] Additionally, one-third of all Americans lived in cities in 1890, with two-thirds of urbanites being immigrants.[26] Many whites blamed the urban crime and blight

---

[22] Wright, *Building the Dream*, 96.
[23] "The Place to Live," 1915 Schantz Estate Brochure, reprinted June 2006, The Oakwood Historical Society.
[24] Wright, *Building the Dream*, 75.
[25] United States Census Bureau, "Table 36. Ohio – Race and Hispanic Origin for Selected Large Cities and Other Places: Earliest Census to 1990."
[26] Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 68.

caused by urbanization on minorities, rather than these problems being a part of the overall process of industrialization, which added to their reasons for living in Oakwood. Jackson writes that suburban homes "seemed immune to the dislocations of an industrializing society and cut off from the toil and turbulence of emerging immigrant ghettos."[27]

The Dayton Flood of 1913 devastated the city and destroyed the homes of many wealthy Daytonians, attracting many upper-class residents to Oakwood due to its elevation above sea level. The flood damaged $100 million worth of property, displaced 65,000 Daytonians, and destroyed more than 1,000 homes.[28] Oakwood's official history claims that "in the years following the flood, Dayton's wealthy moved to Oakwood, relocating on the hilly slopes west of Far Hills" due to the fact that Dayton elites previously had "their mansions were along the river on Dayton's Monument Avenue or in the Riverdale section" before the flood.[29] The Taylor-Simpson Realty Company advertised their Oakwood developments as plats lying "high and dry on the Oakwood Hill" and "240 feet about Dayton's business district where the air is fresh and pure and free from dust and smoke."[30] In 1910, there were only 67 homes in Oakwood.[31] By 1920, Oakwood's population increased to 1,473 and by 1930, 6,494 residents lived there.[32]

Oakwood's mansions were out of reach for most Daytonians, since prior to the New Deal, most Americans did not own houses. In this era, Americans could only become homeowners by one-of-two means: ether purchasing a home outright as banks provided poor mortgages or literally building a home themselves. During the 1920s, one-third of the all

---

[27] Ronald and Ronald, *Oakwood*, 71.
[28] Ibid.
[29] The City of Oakwood, *Oakwood*, 34.
[30] Ronald and Ronald, *Oakwood*, 117.
[31] Ronald and Ronald, *The Lands Between the Miamis*, 209.
[32] Ibid, 325.

Americans lived in substandard housing while at the same time mortgage debit tripled due to poor lending options.[33] Most banks only covered 40 to 50 percent of the appraised value of homes while charging interest rates around 5 to 9 percent, repayable up to five years.[34] Therefore, few Daytonians could afford to move to Oakwood in the early-twentieth century and most residents rented urban dwellings. Those who did own homes often paid high interest rates and fees.

As a result, at the onset of the Great Depression, millions of unemployed Americans defaulted on their mortgages and homelessness became rampant with about 1,000 foreclosures per week by 1933.[35] Fifteen million Americans were unemployed during the Great Depression, one-third of which worked in the construction industry. In Ohio, 40 percent of factory workers and 67 percent of construction workers were unemployed by 1933.[36] By 1934, there were 4,044 vacant residences in Dayton, hundreds of which had no modern conveniences like electricity or plumbing.[37] Moreover, while most families rented their homes for around $20 per month due to unemployment, the City of Dayton still had to pay in-full the rents of over 220 black families and 487 white families.[38]

President Franklin D. Roosevelt and his allies in Congress knew unemployment and the housing crisis were two fundamentally inseparable economic challenges to address in the New Deal. Therefore, FDR signed the Homeowners Refinancing Act of 1933 and the National

---

[33] Wright, *Building the Dream*, 193.
[34] Ibid, 241.
[35] Ibid, 240.
[36] "Great Depression," *Ohio History Connection*, www.ohiohistorycentral.org/w/Great_Depression
[37] Frank A. Caulkins, *Progressive Ohioans and New Deal Housing Programs in Dayton* (Professional Press, 2001), 22.
[38] Ibid, 22.

Housing Act of 1934, establishing the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and Federal Housing Administration. From 1933 until its disbandment in 1951, the HOLC combated foreclosures by negotiating with banks for low-interest, fixed-rate government loans payable up to about twenty years.[39] While the HOLC worked on the financial end preventing foreclosures, the FHA stimulated the construction industry through home construction, prioritizing detached homes in suburbia.[40] According to Wright: "residential construction, together with real-estate investments, played key roles in the national economy" while at the same time the construction of "private homes encouraged individuality."[41]

The racial composition of neighborhoods and the age of buildings have long determined real estate values in American cities. Jackson writes: "The HOLC simply applied these [existing] notions of ethnic and racial worth to real estate appraising on an unprecedented scale" and that "The damage caused by the HOLC came not through its own actions, but through the influence of its appraisal system on the financial decisions of other institutions."[42] HOLC appraisers produced Residential Security Maps which "red lined" neighborhoods based on age and racial demographics as a means of protecting property values, which real estate investors then used to make extrapolations on the property values and riskiness of specific neighborhoods. As a result, the HOLC policies divested in the rehabilitation of urban homes while simultaneously promoted white suburban homeownership, which resulted in the segregation of blacks to Dayton's Westside.[43]

---

[39] Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 195.
[40] Kenneth T. Jackson, "Race, Ethnicity, and Real Estate Appraisal: The Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the Federal Housing Administration," *Journal of Urban History*, (1980) : 430.
[41] Wright, *Building the Dream*, 193.
[42] Ibid, 203.
[43] Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 195-218.

The HOLC color-coded Residential Security Maps on four-tier grading scale of *A* through *D* to determine residential values. An *A* corresponded to homogeneously white neighborhoods with high potential and a *D* corresponded to older industrial as well as minority neighborhoods. The introduction of one minority family into a neighborhood caused appraisers to re-label the area *D* or "hazardous," even if the home was in excellent condition and the homeowner was within the community income bracket. The Residential Security Map of Dayton from April of 1935 shows the areas classified as *D* lying on the historically black dominated Westside. The peninsula formed from Clearwater River and Mad River was dotted with transitional areas as blacks moved into that enclave.[44]

The FHA collaborated closely with the HOLC, using their Residential Security Maps to provide "unbiased professional estimates." Furthermore, the FHA used HOLC maps "to determine the degree of mortgage risk introduced in a mortgage insurance transaction because of the location of the property at a specific site."[45] An FHA appraiser from 1937 wrote about the favorable influences of an area of Oakwood ranked as an *A*: "Restricted – very high class residential – exceptionally good schools – parks – playgrounds – homogeneous as to development and character of property – transportation good – good fire and police protection."[46] The appraiser goes on to notify investors whether there was an "infiltration" of "foreign-born" or "negro" peoples. The FHA helped ensure sustainable white middle-class residential development while turning "the building industry against the minority and inner-city housing

---

[44] Maps & Geospatial Data: Redlining Maps, *The Ohio State University: University Libraries*, March 13, 2017, guides.osu.edu/maps-geospatial-data/maps/redlining
[45] Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 207.
[46] *Area Descriptions for Dayton, Ohio, 1937*. Home Owners' Loan Corporation, box 105, City Survey Files, Record Group 195: Records of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, National Archives II, College Park, Maryland.

market" and encouraging them to support policies of "income and racial segregation of suburbia."[47]

In addition to redlining, the FHA enforced and maintained racial segregation by accepting restrictive covenants as legal documents. Between the 1920s and the 1940s, restrictive covenants were agreements embedded in the deed of a home as to which socioeconomic class of people their home may be sold to as a means of protecting property values. The FHA's 1934 manual provides a model covenant as follows: "No persons of any race other than [race to be inserted] shall use or occupy any building or any lot, except that this covenant shall not prevent occupancy by domestic servants of a different race domiciled with an owner or tenant."[48]

Furthermore, the FHA prioritized lending towards the development of detached homes in suburbia and divested in older housing in the urban core. Jackson claims that "FHA insurance went to new residential developments on the edges of metropolitan areas, to the neglect of core cities" because the FHA "favored the construction of single-family projects and discouraged construction of multi-family projects."[49] Additionally, "loans for the repair of existing structures were small and for short duration, which meant that a family could more easily purchase a new home than modernize an old one."[50] As a result, this perpetuated the concentration of many minorities and those too poor for homeownership into inner-city housing projects and rental properties. In 1934, 16,887 white Daytonians owned homes and 26,002 rented, while 408 black

---

[47] Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 213.
[48] Richard C. Stearns, *Racial Content of FHA Underwriting Practices, 1934-1962*, University of Baltimore archives
[49] Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 206.
[50] Ibid, 206.

Daytonians owned homes and 3,453 rented.[51] Although, the FHA quickly began promoting homeownership in Dayton, as it loaned $6 million between 1934 and 1939.[52]

These federal agencies spurred limited growth, but as a result of the Second World War, suburbanization around Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton. Upon the outbreak of the war, Dayton factories began supporting the war effort through munitions manufacturing. According to the Ohio History Connection: "Dayton benefited greatly from the growth of wartime industries during World War II and received approximately $1.7 billion in government defense contracts during the war."[53] On January 1, 1942, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base located in Fairborn received $17.5 million in federal funds to expand the base by 750 acres and construct a new Air Service Command headquarters.[54] Throughout the war, Dayton manufacturing employed 46.3 percent of the city's black population; 16.2 percent of whom were recent southern migrants.[55] In 1942, the Dayton Public Welfare Office announced that while 4,000 Daytonians were in search of a home, only 40 percent would be able to find one.[56] The National Housing Agency (NHA) funded the construction of 1,500 family units and 125 dormitories in 1942, followed by the construction of an additional 1,075 housing units in 1944.[57] Federal government constructed most of the wartime housing around WPAFB for workers.

---

[51] "Housing Survey: City of Dayton (1934)," Dayton City Plan Board, Dayton Metro Library archives, 31.
[52] "$6,000,000 FHA Loans in Dayton," *The Wall Street Journal* (New York City, NY), Jul. 3, 1939.
[53] "Dayton, Ohio," *Ohio History Connection*, www.ohiohistorycentral.org/w/Dayton,_Ohio
[54] www.daytonhistorybooks.com/page/page/1652479.htm
[55] National Housing Agency News Release, "Postwar Housing Survey of Consumer Demand in the Dayton Area (July 1945)," (September 29, 1945), Dayton Metro Library Genealogy Center, 2.
[56] "Ohio Modern: Preserving Our Recent Past Statewide Historic Context" (Gray & Pape, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio, 2010), 38.
[57] Ibid, 38.

WPAFB contracted Hebble Homes to construct subsidized wartime housing units in Fairborn for its workers.[58] After the Second World War – as WPAFB became a major aeronautical research center for the United States Air Force and Dayton's largest employer – the City of Fairborn to converted the wartime apartments into low-income housing.[59]

Wartime housing was cheap and temporary, but numerous Daytonians still needed housing at war's end. FDR and Congress established the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) through the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI Bill), with the anticipation of millions of returning servicemen after the Second World War. A high percentage of Daytonians envisioned themselves living becoming homeowners after the war. The NHA predicted that 20 percent of families that stayed in Dayton after the war were expected to move from their present quarters after the war.[60] Specifically, 5,700 families indicated that they expected to buy or build a new house, 4,800 families planned to buy an existing house, 5,000 wished to rent other quarters, and 10,100 families planned to move out of Dayton.[61] Furthermore, according to the NHA "the median price which families who plan to buy or build a new home expect to pay is $6,630 with 13 percent expecting to pay less than $5,000; 17 percent from $5,000 to $5,999; 49 percent from $6,000 to $7,999; and 21 percent indicated an intention of paying $8,000 or more."[62] Most FHA homes cost between $6,000 and $8,000, therefore, with the FHA debt ceiling at $20,000 and the average weekly income for Daytonians at $60 to $79, suburban

---

[58] Fairborn City Council and Fairborn Planning Commission, "Fairborn Development Plan," (Report, OhioLink, Fairborn City Council, Fairborn, Ohio, 1969).
[59] Ibid.
[60] National Housing Agency News Release, "Postwar Housing Survey of Consumer Demand in the Dayton Area (July 1945)," 7.
[61] Ibid.
[62] Ibid.

homeownership became more affordable than renting long-term.[63] Furthermore, the VA allowed veterans to borrow the entire appraised value of a housing without a down payment.[64] As a result – regardless of whether they supported racially segregated neighborhoods or not – white families moved to suburbia because the FHA provided them with the most affordable housing options.

During the Postwar Era, businessmen took advantage of flexible FHA and VA mortgages and consumer demand by building mass-producing suburbs from the ground up. Most notably, Levitt and Sons built Levittown on Long Island, New York between 1947 and 1951. Wright argues that the Levitt Brothers "stayed with traditional styling but used modern construction techniques."[65] The Levitt Brothers built 17,450 homes for 75,000 residents in Levittown, Long Island between 1947 and 1951.[66] Levitt and Sons tapped into the fears and insecurities of whites who lived through two world wars and the Great Depression, by advertising suburbia as a place of peace and security. Wright states: "The arguments that brought them to the suburbs unilaterally condemned the city as a dangerous place for children and played on the insecurity of an entire generation of parents."[67] These perfectly manicured, mass-produced, and subdivided communities provided stability to many twentieth century families against the uncertainties of modern life.

Home developer Charles C. Huber pursued a similar strategy as the Levitt Brothers near Dayton after the war. Huber inherited 200 acres of Wayne Township from his father in 1954,

---

[63] National Housing Agency News Release, "Postwar Housing Survey of Consumer Demand in the Dayton Area (July 1945)," 7. | Wright, *Building the Dream*, 242.
[64] Wright, *Building the Dream*, 243.
[65] Ibid, 253.
[66] Ibid, 253.
[67] Ibid, 257.

and in 1956, he began mass-producing modest homes primarily for military veterans and factory workers.[68] He spent $750,000 to build Huber Utilities – the first privately licensed water and sewer treatment plant in Ohio – for the development of rural Wayne Township.[69] Unlike the homes in Oakwood, Huber Homes never designed custom housing, rather the company stuck to their 1,000 to 1,400 square feet Cape Cod and Ranch styles which were notorious for mass-produced brick façades.[70] Wright writes:

> Prefabrication seemed a promising route toward lower costs and greater numbers of units. With government funding, new materials had been tried out during the war years and had proved successful: "stressed skin" plywood panels for walls, laminated wood roofs, welded-steel roof trusses, steel-frame wall panels with "clapboards" of painted aluminum, "predecorated" gypsum-board ceilings, were all produced in factories.[71]

Despite mass-produced aesthetic, the name of "ranch" style homes evoked the bucolic imagery around the homes in older suburbs like Oakwood.[72] Furthermore, all Huber Heights homes cost under $10,000, making them in reach for homebuyers with FHA assistance.[73] Because the federal government prioritized funding for single-family detached homes, Huber Homes constructed more than 10,707 single-family homes, in addition to a mere 2,258 multi-family units, between 1956 and 1992.[74]

The affordability of automobiles after the Second World War and the peripheral location of postwar suburbs along highways, helped end streetcar service in Dayton as well as force

---

[68] "Ohio Modern: Preserving Our Recent Past Statewide Historic Context" (Gray & Pape, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio, 2010), 122.
[69] Ibid, 55
[70] Ibid, 122.
[71] Wright, *Building the Dream*, 244.
[72] Ibid, 251.
[73] "Ohio Modern: Preserving Our Recent Past Statewide Historic Context" (Gray & Pape, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio, 2010), 122.
[74] "History of Huber Heights," *Huber Heights Chamber of Commerce*, www.huberheightschamber.com/community/history/

suburbanites to rely on the automobile. According to Jackson, the number of electric streetcars peaked in 1917 at 72,911 while total ridership crested in 1923 at 15.7 billion, while cars gradually became the preferred transit option of many Americans.[75] Between 1910 and 1927, the number of automobile repair shops in Dayton had increased from 20 to 78, with over 40,000 automobiles registered in Dayton.[76] The Dayton City Plan Board noted this change in 1934 and observed: "It is, therefore, clearly evident that any growth that the city showed in the past ten years was gained almost entirely by annexation. Unquestionably, in this respect, the automobile and the advanced sub-division design were among the most important factors which brought this transition about."[77] The lack of trolley ridership in Dayton, in particular, pressured the City Transit Company of Dayton in September of 1947 to replace end streetcar services.[78]

This shift from mass-transit to private automobile ownership grew enormously in the 1950s. President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Congress enacted the Interstate Highway Act of 1956 establishing the construction of a 41,000 mile interstate highway system to make automobile travel more efficient. Two interstate highways in this era intersected near Dayton: I-75 which stretches from Michigan to Florida and I-70 which spans territory from Utah to Maryland. Huber Heights was one of the first suburbs in Dayton to take advantage of the Interstate Highway System to promote suburban development. Huber Heights developed in a triangle shape surrounded by Interstate 70 to its north, Interstate 75 to its west, and Ohio State Route 4 to its east.

---

[75] Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 171.
[76] Miller, "Transportation Revolution and the Development of Oakwood, Ohio, 1870-1930," 61.
[77] Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 171.
[78] "History," *Greater Dayton Regional Transit Authority*, http://www.i-riderta.org/about-rta/history

Unlike streetcars, which dictated the routes suburbanites could travel, automobiles liberated suburbanites from reliance on the central business district. At the same time, metropolitan residents became increasingly reliant on automobiles as not only residential areas, but business and industry relocated to peripheral locations. Huber Heights consequently grew from 1,921 residents in 1950 to 12,022 by 1960 and nearly 28,000 by 1970, primarily as a result of the construction of I-70 through the suburb.[79] Since the incorporation of Huber Heights, its logistical position along I-70 helped to attract numerous businesses to relocate to the municipality including FedEx, Coca-Cola, and Yellow Freights.[80] Today Huber Heights is home to over 40,000 suburbanites.[81]

To many Daytonians, a sense of normalcy revolves around the fact that most white middle-class Daytonians live in suburbs accessible by automobile while many low-income minorities live in the inner-city and rely on public transportation. However, Americans suburbs were not always havens for middle-class automobile owners. This structure to American suburbs is a more recent creation of the twentieth century. From Dayton's founding in 1796 until its industrialization in the mid-nineteenth century, with public transportation yet to be invented, the density of Dayton caused residents to live in dense urban dwellings and to access the central business district by foot. At the turn of the nineteenth century, early streetcar suburbs like Oakwood represented the aristocratic lifestyles of Dayton industrialists – including many from the National Cash Register Corporation – through their mansions and summer estates. While today many Dayton suburbanites view public transportation with disdain and associate it with

---

[79] "History of Huber Heights," *Huber Heights Chamber of Commerce*, www.huberheightschamber.com/community/history/
[80] Ibid.
[81] Ibid.

low-income urbanites, through the early-twentieth century, even the wealthiest of Daytonians traveled by and relied on streetcars. Additionally, factors including the bucolic atmosphere free from pollution and urban congestion as well as racial segregation helped promote living in Oakwood over urban neighborhoods. Due to poor mortgage options prior to the New Deal and restrictive covenants, Oakwood was inaccessible to a majority of Daytonians in the early-twentieth century. While Dayton segregated neighborhoods before the New Deal – unlike today in which segregation takes on a greater distance between suburbs and the urban core – Daytonians of different racial and ethnic backgrounds lived in relatively close proximity to each other, as streetcars connected all neighborhoods to downtown.

Soon after the Dayton Flood of 1913 leveled much of Dayton's infrastructure, the onset of the Great Depression brought about high unemployment and homelessness, which helped create slums and homelessness within Dayton. Contrastingly to today, most Daytonians rented their dwellings as homeownership was unaffordable. Numerous Daytonians lived in poor conditions and had no other options until federal policy under the New Deal allowed for mass-suburbanization. In an effort to bring housing to the masses, the New Deal established the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the Federal Housing Administration, which prioritized mortgages for the construction of detached homes in suburbia over the rehabilitation of older homes in the urban core. At the same time, these federal agencies based real estate values on both the age and racial compositions of neighborhoods. As a result, white middle-class Daytonians moved to suburbia because of its affordability, which consequentially segregated blacks to Dayton's older housing on the Westside.

During the Second World War, many Daytonians lived in poor conditions or temporary housing, as resources went towards the war effort. Munitions manufacturing was the primary

means of employment at the time in Dayton, therefore, these housing conditions were the only options for most people. However, at war's end, the policies of the HOLC, the FHA, and the VA allowed whites to escape the conditions of urban congestion and poverty. In 1956, Charles C. Huber took advantage of the housing shortage and built Huber Heights from scratch by mass-producing affordable homes for the working-class and veterans. The federal government's response to the postwar housing need by promoting new suburban development over rehabilitating existing neighborhoods caused emerging suburbs like Huber Heights to rely on automobiles for transportation. As a result of the Interstate Highway Act, Huber Heights grew around I-70, which attracted business and industry to relocate from former industrial locations. which made it more difficult for urbanites without an automobile to find employment.

These factors allowed suburbs to develop further from downtown, bringing an end to the electric streetcar in Dayton. This left other kinds of less reliable public transportation as the primary means of commuting for urbanites too poor to afford an automobile.

Part II

In September of 1966, Dayton, Ohio experienced a racially charged urban riot on the city's predominantly black Westside. Many white suburbanites were taken aback by the riots and exclaimed "How could this happen in a city like Dayton?" and feared that social unrest would spread to white neighborhoods. Many whites attributed the conditions which led to the Dayton Riot of 1966 with character flaws and poor housing choices within the black community. However, there were three main contributing factors which laid the foundation for the Dayton Riot of 1966 including housing discrimination, unemployment, police brutality, and the failure of Dayton-based War on Poverty agencies.

Throughout the early-twentieth century, both restrictive covenants and the housing polices of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Veteran's Administration promoted suburban homeownership and racial segregation. These federal agencies divested in the urban core while prioritizing the growth of Dayton's eastern suburbs around Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and Wright State University. As manufacturing jobs left the urban core throughout the mid-twentieth century, some of the only employment opportunities for Daytonians were around WPAFB and WSU. Beginning in the mid-1950s, the City of Dayton decided to displace of hundreds of black residents to construct I-75 through the Westside. The city also outsourced law enforcement jobs to white suburbanites, which spurred instances of police brutality. By the mid-1960s, the Supporting Committee on Preventative Effort and Moving Ahead Together – a coalition of civil rights organizations which received federal dollars from the Office of Economic Opportunity during the War on Poverty – attempted to address these socioeconomic problems on Dayton's Westside. However, inter-organizational conflicts over how to allocate federal dollars caused many black Daytonians to

view the civil rights organizations as overly bureaucratic and ineffective, helping to push some Westside residents towards more kinds of protest. After the murder of an unarmed black man named Lester Mitchell, the combined effects these socioeconomic realities helped to ignite the Dayton Riot of 1966.

Between the First World War and the Second World War, high unemployment during the Great Depression and wartime manufacturing jobs attracted southern African Americans migrants to northern industrial cities like Dayton in unprecedented numbers. Between 1920 and 1940, Dayton's black population increased from 9,025 to 20,273 residents.[1] Even before the establishment of the HOLC or the FHA, white Daytonians segregated blacks west of the Great Miami River. Real estate agents enforced racial segregation primarily through the use of restrictive covenants, which were documents imbedded into the deeds of homes restricting the sale of the home to "undesirable" populations.[2] Local residents also took initiative in maintaining racial segregation. *The Baltimore Afro-American* reported in July of 1927 that white Daytonians rallied and protested the "black encroachment" occurring in their neighborhood. The newspaper contended that whites were infuriated because they had made agreements with banks "to refuse to loan money on property bought by colored people."[3] One man at the rally exclaimed that "negroes" moving into white communities should be "shot" and "whipped" like

---

[1] United States Census Bureau, "Table 36. Ohio – Race and Hispanic Origin for Selected Large Cities and Other Places: Earliest Census to 1990."
[2] Marian Morton, "Deferring Dreams: Racial and Religious Covenants in Shaker Heights, Cleveland Heights and East Cleveland, 1925 to 1970," 1. teachingcleveland.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/02/deferring%20dreams%20marion%20morton.pdf
[3] "Lynching Bee Is Proposed In Dayton Segregation Row," *The Baltimore Afro-American* (Baltimore, MD), Jul. 30, 1927.

horses.[4] Additionally, another man stated that "If a few niggers get a good sound beating they will know their places."[5]

Racial segregation was commonplace in Dayton even before the creation of the HOLC or the FHA due to these restrictive covenants and violence. In 1934, the Civil Works Administration (CWA) studied the effects of restrictive covenants and racial steering on Dayton neighborhoods. Historian Frank A. Kaulkins argues that the CWA's findings were a "wakeup call with racial overtones" which showed "a strong correlation between slum areas and racial settlement patterns."[6] Kaulkins notes that there was a "growing concentration of black families immediately west of the center of the city."[7] Additionally, the Dayton Urban League remarked in 1945:

> The housing situation in Dayton for Negroes was serious prior to 1940. The new demands for war workers has make it acute. Residential segregation, restrictive housing covenants, overcrowding, and unfavorable neighborhood conditions are forces affecting the Negro in relation to housing. Though many of the poor white migrants live under adverse conditions, they are able to improve their situation when they arrive at economic sufficiency. The Negro, on the other hand, regardless of his improved condition is frozen in blighted areas and substandard houses solely on account of racial identity.[8]

Therefore, the establishment of the HOLC and the FHA during the New Deal simply reinforced these notions of race and property value on a federal level. To this point, when white Daytonians – whether purposefully or not – bought homes in suburbia through the FHA during the New Deal Era, they helped to segregate the city. Historian Kenneth T. Jackson states that "The result, if not the intent, of the public housing program of the United States was to segregate the races, to

---

[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Caulkins, *Progressive Ohioans and New Deal Housing Programs in Dayton*, 17.
[7] Ibid, 17.
[8] The Dayton Urban League, "Urban League Records," 1943-1968, MS-38, Wright State University archives, Fairborn, Ohio.

concentrate the disadvantaged in inner cities, and to reinforce the image of suburbia as a place of refuge for the problems of race, crime, and poverty."[9]

The federal government created low-income public housing as a form of social safety net housing for Americans unable to meet the requirements of HOLC or FHA mortgages. Due to the fact that race underpinned many New Deal housing policies, these programs also automatically barred blacks and other minorities from homeownership in new suburban neighborhoods. In Dayton, these policies caused a concentration of blacks on the city's Westside. Established in 1933, the Public Works Administration not only stimulated the construction industry, but built low-income public housing. This was critical due to the fact that of the fifteen million unemployed Americans during the Great Depression, a third worked in the construction industry.[10] According to Wright: "Within a year [1934], the PWA itself began to buy land, raze slums, and build housing. Over the next four years, it was responsible for destroying more than ten thousand substandard housing units and erecting almost twenty-two thousand new units in fifty-nine projects."[11] In 1933, the PWA granted construction jobs to 5,000 unemployed Daytonians on public relief, and subsidized $2,280,835 in labor costs and $178,000 in materials in an effort to boost Dayton's economy. In 1939, the PWA funded $16,000,000 towards the construct of WPAFB and housing for wartime workers.[12]

The United States Housing Act of 1937 replaced the PWA with the United States Housing Authority (USHA), making the government almost entirely responsible for the construction of subsidized low-income housing. The USHA lent up to 90 percent of the

---

[9] Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 219.
[10] Wright, *Building the Dream*, 223.
[11] Ibid, 225.
[12] "Improvement Program in Dayton This Year to Cost $16,000,000," *The Wall Street Journal* Jan. 16, 1939.

construction costs of a housing project through local housing agencies.[13] In 1940, the Dayton Metropolitan Housing Authority applied for $960,000 in federal funding to build the city's first public housing project named DeSoto Bass Courts. Although urban planners designed this project during the Great Depression exclusively for black families, it was initially used for both white and black wartime workers during the Second World War. The federal government funded the rapid expansion of DeSoto Bass Courts during the war to 1,005 housing units with the prioritization of wartime workers.[14] Due to the addition of middle-class workers to the project, the average family had a weekly income of $16.33 and paid a monthly rent of $12.72.[15] Therefore, when middle-class residents left at war's end, black residents could no longer afford to maintain the project alone, considering rent was around $10 on the Westside.[16]

Although public housing projects began during the Great Depression, their presence rapidly increased in American cities such as Dayton after the Housing Act of 1949. This act allowed third party investors and municipalities conducting urban renewal projects to demolish neighborhoods categorized as "blighted." The USHA stipulated that if investors cleared slums and built low-income housing, the federal government would subsidize two-thirds of the construction costs.[17] Investors built high-rise projects, consolidating space for other urban development projects. Because the Housing Act of 1949 only required neighborhoods to be 20 percent "blighted" in order to receive federal subsidies, cities haphazardly bulldozed numerous

---

[13] Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 224.
[14] "Black History: 'We had a place we all loved' DeSoto Bass – First Public Housing for Blacks Was a Set Up," *Dayton Daily News*, Feb. 29, 2004. Page A1.
[15] "Good Housing Essential To National Defense–Horne," *New Journal and Guide*, Feb. 22, 1941. Page 9.
[16] Caulkins, *Progressive Ohioans and New Deal Housing Programs in Dayton*, 22.
[17] Ibid. 232.

minority and immigrant neighborhoods for the construction of new hospitals, sports arenas, and convention centers.[18]

A critical component to public housing was the fact that it was voluntary and required municipalities to establish housing agencies in order receive federal funding. Historian Kenneth T. Jackson states that "Because municipalities had discretion on where and when to build public housing, the projects invariably reinforced racial segregation. A suburb that did not wish to tarnish its exclusive image by having public housing within its precincts could simply refuse to create a housing agency."[19] As a result, public housing concentrated in the urban core as many suburbs saw it as burden on their tax base, leaving few housing options for low-income minorities.[20]

The Haymarket District and the West Dayton suffered from a lack of funding and housing grew increasingly overcrowded and dilapidated, especially as more southern African Americans continued to migrate to Dayton. By 1950, 4,480 black Daytonians lived in overcrowded conditions.[21] *The Chicago Defender* reported that between 1950 and 1955, new housing for black Daytonians increased by 4 percent while the black population increased about 23 percent, yet only 1,070 out of 26,247 housing units built during this time were made available to blacks.[22] In 1961, president of the West Dayton Area Council Don Ellis expressed to the *Dayton Daily News*: "More southern Negroes are arriving every day. The last census showed only 14,000 housing units available for 58,000 Negroes in Dayton, less than one room per

---

[18] Wright, *Building the Dream*, 232.
[19] Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 225.
[20] Ibid. 225.
[21] "Negro Housing Survey / [prepared by the Council of Social Agencies at the request of the Dayton Council for Defense]," 1942, 317.717 D276N, Dayton Metro Library archives, Dayton, Ohio.
[22] "Bare Bias In Dayton Housing," *The Chicago Defender* (Chicago, IL), Dec. 22, 1956.

person. Families are growing, too. We need housing to buy, not rent. We need it now."[23] Between 1950 and 1970, Dayton's black population increased from 34,151 to 72,284, or 14 percent to 30.5 percent of the Dayton's total population.[24] The President of the Edgemont Improvement Association – a community action organization – Mrs. Clarissa Mukes stated that "People in Edgemont have no place to relocate to. They can't afford to buy houses. They are low income people. Few can qualify for FHA relocation loans. These people have nowhere else to go."[25]

In 1956, the City of Dayton began several urban renewal projects, including the West Dayton renewal project. At the time, nearly 3,600 acres – or one-sixth – of Dayton qualified as "blighted."[26] Another estimate approximates 60 percent of Dayton was blighted to some degree.[27] The West Dayton project covered over 1,000 acres and displaced 500 black families due to the construction of Interstate 75. Some black families attempted to move into white neighborhoods, but faced heavy resistance. On September 26, 1963, a black masonry contractor named James Fuller, along with his wife and three kids, moved into the all-white neighborhood of Townview. As a result, around 100 whites rioted outside Fuller's house, throwing rocks, bottles, and eggs while chanting "Two, four, six, eight, run the niggers out of state!" The Dayton Police Department had to call in 100 riot-trained police officers to break up the mob.[28] In 1961,

---

[23] "Housing Riddle Finds Negroes "In Middle"," *Dayton Daily News*, Sep. 25, 1961.
[24] United States Census Bureau, "Table 36. Ohio – Race and Hispanic Origin for Selected Large Cities and Other Places: Earliest Census to 1990."
[25] "Housing Riddle Finds Negroes "In Middle"," *Dayton Daily News*, Sep. 25, 1961.
[26] "Metro Report At A Glance," *The Journal Herald*, Nov. 2, 1959.
[27] "Drive Is Launched By City To End Housing Blight," *The Journal Herald*, Feb. 6, 1960.
[28] "Report of Huge Grant For Rights Aid Denied," *The Washington Post* (Washington, DC, District of Columbia), Sep. 27, 1963.

the Dayton Urban League reported on the effect racial integration had on the neighborhood of Westwood:

> Housing for Dayton's expanding Negro population is following a traditional pattern – the construction of new homes on open land in/or adjacent to the existing Negro community, and the movement of Negro families into adjacent neighborhoods formerly occupied by white people. For instance, in 1956 we reported that the movement of Negroes into the Westwood area precipitated anger, frustration, and panic. Nevertheless, the movement has continued. In 1950 the Negro population in the Westwood area was ½ of 1%. The 1960 census shows that the Negro population in the Westwood area is now 60.2%.[29]

Despite white resistance which made it difficult for blacks to leave the Westside, numerous black families moved to adjacent Jefferson Township, because it was sparsely inhabited farmland. Furthermore, between 1956 and 1960, 15,046 homes were constructed in the Dayton metropolitan area, only 2,523 of which were within Dayton's municipal boundaries.[30] Between 1950 and 1960, Dayton's black population only increased by 0.6 percent, representative of the migration into Jefferson Township, which in 1960 was 40% black.[31] Despite the migration to Jefferson Township, around 90 percent of Dayton's black population remained on the Westside during the 1960s.[32]

Throughout the Civil Rights Movement in the North, the fight to end residential segregation directly related to the fight for jobs. Up until the 1964 Civil Rights Act provided blacks legislative means to combat discrimination, most business, restaurants, and public

---

[29] The Dayton Urban League, "Brief Status of Urban Renewal Operations," "Urban League Records," 1943-1968, MS-38, Wright State University archives, Fairborn, Ohio.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Mary Esther Ritchey, "A Descriptive Study of the Civil Disturbance in Dayton, Ohio, September 1, 1966, in the Context of its Local and National Setting" (Master's thesis, The Ohio State University, 1967), 9.

institutions in Dayton refused to not hire or cater to blacks.[33] In Dayton, local civil rights organizations fought to desegregate Rike's Department Store and the Roosevelt High School public swimming pool. The Dayton Urban League stated: "The denial of service to Negroes in most downtown restaurants, their exclusion from equal use of swimming facilities in some of the high schools are typical situations which are fraught with emotion and conflict."[34]

After the Second World War, manufacturing jobs relocated from the urban cores to new locations in suburbia and the American south and increasingly became more automated. This made it much harder for low-income urbanites, many of whom were black, to find employment. Historian Greta de Jong writes: "Corporations' ability to leave if conditions were not to their liking undermined the power of labor unions and discouraged governments from implementing policies opposed by business leaders, such as higher taxes or more generous social services."[35] Throughout the mid-twentieth century, numerous Dayton-based corporations relocated. Joseph Watras remarks that between 1960 and 1980, Dayton's population dropped by 70,000 residents due to the relocation of corporations including Frigidaire, Dayton Tire, and NCR.[36] During the 1960s, blue collar employment became scarce as 15,000 manufacturing jobs had left NCR.[37] Therefore, as fewer jobs became available in the urban core at corporations like NCR, many of

---

[33] The Dayton Urban League, "Urban League Records," 1943-1968, MS-38, "Southern Exposure: Segregation Here Ended Only Lately," Wright State University archives, Fairborn, Ohio.
[34] "National Urban League Community Relations Project: Summary and recommendations of a study of the social and economic conditions of the Negro population of Dayton, Ohio, 1945." Kent State University archives, Schomburg Microfilm Series, Micro-35 E185 .S37x no.111
[35] Ibid. 173-174.
[36] Watras, "The Racial Desegregation of Dayton, Ohio, Public Schools, 1966-2008," 93.
[37] Samuel R. Staley, "Dayton, Ohio: The Rise, Fall and Stagnation of a Former Industrial Juggernaut," (newgeography, 2008) www.newgeography.com/content/00153-dayton-ohio-the-rise-fall-and-stagnation-a-former-industrial-juggernaut

the available jobs were further away at WPAFB. These factors made it difficult for low-income urbanites reliant on public transportation to reach a job in the suburbs.

After the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Dayton-based corporations like NCR attempted to implement policies that signified that they were Equal Opportunity Employers. A document from NCR in 1965 stated the corporation's intent to find more minorities to fill its white-collar positions: "It is imperative that all units of this company… take affirmative action, immediately and on sustained basis, to acquire suitable minority-group employees."[38] NCR acknowledged the difficulty in finding qualified candidates saying that "the qualifications for salesmen and servicemen are high. Obtaining people from a minority group already beset with educational and aptitude deficiencies will be difficult."[39] Even when Dayton companies were willing to hiring minorities, the conditions on the Westside frequently produced unqualified candidates. The fact that only 32 percent of black Daytonians held a high school diploma during the 1960s also influenced their prospects.[40] Dayton's Community Research, Inc. reported that although blacks made up 10 percent of Dayton's labor force, and no more than 20 percent of the city's population, they accounted for over 33 percent of Dayton's unemployed in 1965.[41]

The endemic unemployment among black Americans and pressure from civil rights organizations helped push the federal government towards legislative intervention. On January 8, 1964, President Lyndon Johnson declared in his first State of the Union Address: "The administration today, here and now, declares unconditional war on poverty in America."[42] The

---

[38] "NCR Moves to Employ More Negroes," *The Journal Herald* (Dayton, OH) Nov. 30, 1965.
[39] Ibid.
[40] The Dayton Urban League, "Urban League Records," 1943-1968, MS-38, Series V: News clippings, box 37, folder 2, "Wanted: More Jobs," Wright State University archives, Fairborn, Ohio.
[41] "Experts Look at Negro Job Picture," *The Journal Herald* (Dayton, OH), Oct. 28, 1965.
[42] Sugrue, *Sweet Land of Liberty*, 356.

Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (War on Poverty) focused on urban black and Latino communities through "a joint Federal-local effort."[43] The War on Poverty provided $800 million its first year on job training, economic development programs, and improving social services.[44]

The two main War on Poverty organizations in Dayton were the Supporting Committee on Preventative Effort, established in 1964, and Moving Ahead Together, established in 1965. However, in the mid-1960s, federal officials threatened to deny MAT its federal dollars funding unless they removed its director Albert Holland for his "controversial" tactics.[45] In her 1967 undergraduate thesis *A Descriptive Study of the Civil Disturbance in Dayton, Ohio*, Mary Ritchey writes that "MAT has been the most controversial of the anti-poverty projects and one of the least understood. During its one and one-half year running feud with the community and the status quo it has attacked real estate, schools, and newspaper and welfare interests."[46] Tension arose between MAT and SCOPE due to a War on Poverty policy requiring MAT apply and receive federal funds through SCOPE. Holland viewed the policies of the Office of Economic Opportunity as individual organizations form and apply for funding of their own projects, and he did not agree with the new bureaucracy. Holland and supporters viewed SCOPE as promoting the liberal "establishment" and declared they "won't be ruled by the people downtown."[47]

This inter-organizational conflict created a rift in both the Dayton Civil Rights Movement and the city's black community. Many supporters of SCOPE criticized MAT for its "lack of

---

[43] Ibid. 356.
[44] Greta de Jong, *Invisible Enemy: The African American Freedom Struggle after 1965* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 33.
[45] Mary Esther Ritchey, "A Descriptive Study of the Civil Disturbance in Dayton, Ohio, September 1, 1966, in the Context of is Local and National Setting" (Undergraduate Research Thesis, The Ohio State University, 1967), 68.
[46] Ibid, 68.
[47] "MAT-SCOPE Meeting Stormy," *The Journal Herald*, Jun. 13, 1967.

administrative skill" and that it needed "more effective community organization," while others saw the conflict as part of the bureaucratic structure of federal programs.[48] The controversial tactics which brought about the call for Holland's resignation were seen as inefficient and aimless by manly black Daytonians. A woman cried out at a community meeting: "I'm asking Mr. Holland. Have you considered the poor people? If Mr. Holland cares about West Dayton and the poor, let him step down."[49] Although SCOPE had funding at their fingertips, political disagreements over the implementation of funding led to few effective job training programs.

The inter-organizational conflicts between SCOPE and MAT brought few job training programs to Dayton's Westside. Most notably in January of 1966, when SCOPE entered Dayton in the running to participate in LBJ's Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC). However, as had been commonplace within Dayton civil rights groups, federal antipoverty officials, Dayton Urban League officials, as well as SCOPE and MAT, disagreed over bureaucratic details over Dayton's participation in NYC. The NYC would have provided SCOPE with $87,000 in job training services as well as counselling for high school dropouts on Dayton's Westside.

By the late-1960s, housing discrimination, high unemployment, and the inability of civil rights groups like SCOPE and MAT to relieve the socioeconomic pressures helped turn many black Americans towards more radical solutions. Throughout the United States at this time, only 46 percent of northern blacks saw state governments as "helpful" and only about one-third saw local governments as their "allies."[50] Throughout the late-1960s, urban riots – more often than not –ignited due to officer involved shootings. Historian Thomas J. Sugrue argues that riots

---

[48] Mary Esther Ritchey, "A Descriptive Study of the Civil Disturbance in Dayton, Ohio, September 1, 1966, in the Context of is Local and National Setting" (Undergraduate Research Thesis, The Ohio State University, 1967), 68.
[49] Ibid.
[50] Ibid. 357.

"followed a pattern that would become commonplace during the mid-1960s – beginning with a police incident, ending with angry crowds in the streets."[51]

Within a short period during the late-1960s, the United States witnessed urban riots across from Newark to Los Angeles, including Dayton. Historian Thomas J. Sugrue argues that the greatest problem northern police departments faced was the lack of black officers and high rates of police brutality. Sugrue writes: "The fact that northern police departments were nearly all white through the early 1960s did little to inspire blacks' confidence in their unbiased enforcement of the law… many police departments professionalized, eliminated residency requirements, and recruited in suburbs… the result was a racial gap."

Therefore, after the murder of a black man named Lester Mitchell on September 1, 1966, rumors spread like wildfire throughout the Westside that it was an officer involved shooting, quickly escalating racial tensions. Although no officers had been involved, many black residents already held animosities towards the Dayton Police Department (DPD). In 1966, only 13 black officers served in the DPD out of 378 white officers, whom were known to refer to black residents as "boy" and "nigger."[52] The riot, in part, formed rapidly from spreading rumors about it being an officer involved shooting. Anger and frustration grew as the crowd of onlookers transformed into a mob of rioters. Emergency units took their time arriving at Mitchell's home and local residents yelled "Do something! You pigs wouldn't let a white man lay here like this!"[53] Although Lester Mitchell did not die until 7:55 p.m., riots already spread along a thirty-

---

[51] Sugrue, *Sweet Land of Liberty*, 325.
[52] Mary Esther Ritchey, "A Descriptive Study of the Civil Disturbance in Dayton, Ohio, September 1, 1966, in the Context of is Local and National Setting" (Undergraduate Research Thesis, The Ohio State University, 1967), 54.
[53] Daniel L. Baker and Gwen Nalls, *Blood in the Streets: Racism, Riots and Murders in the Heartland of America* (Dayton, OH: Forensic Publications, LLC, 2014), 57.

block stretch of Third Street which crosses into East Dayton.[54] Several hours before Mitchell's death at 12:30 p.m., the situation escalated to the point at which Ohio Governor Jim Rhodes deployed several Ohio Army National Guard Units into the Westside, with over 525 police officers and National Guardsmen deployed during the riot's height. When the riots subsided after three days, Governor Rhodes withdrew the National Guard, with over 175 people arrested.[55]

While the Black Power Movement may have influenced the riots to an extent, many mainstream media sources overly attributed the riots to organized efforts by groups such as the Black Panther Party. While many black leftists argued the urban riots were the beginnings of revolutions, many whites believed the radical rhetoric and argued the coinciding urban riots were planned assaults on America, rather than backlashes against systemic racism. According to Sugrue: "many whites, particularly law enforcement officers and elected officials, took black radicals at their word. They viewed the riots as products of a conspiracy, hatched by the cells of black militants who hoped for nothing short of overthrowing the white power structure. But there was little evidence that the urban rebellions of the 1960s were planned, coordinated, and controlled.[56] On June 12, 1967, Dayton civil rights leader W. S. McIntosh of Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), along with H. Rap Brown of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), held a rally against employment discrimination at the Wesley Center on the Westside.[57] Following the rally, another urban riot broke out, which many contributed to a coordinated effort by McIntosh and Brown. Brown stated to *Dayton Daily News* that "We're here to make white men get on their knees."[58] Additionally, Brown refuted peaceful rhetoric by

---

[54] Ibid. 66-67.
[55] Ibid. 96.
[56] Sugrue, *Sweet Land of Liberty*, 334.
[57] Baker and Nalls, *Blood in the Street*, 137.
[58] Ibid, 138.

telling Westside residents "Nothing killed a nigger like too much love…. be non-violent against each other, but non-violence is not the way to deal with whites."[59] Many Daytonians contributed these radical statements as responsible for the riots, despite the fact that CORE and SNCC had no coordinated plans.

While Dayton newspapers focused on attacks against white pedestrians, helping to create panic within white neighborhoods, most rioters only targeted those who they blamed for problems on Dayton's Westside. According to Sugrue: "Rioters chose their targets carefully, and had just two: the police and shopkeepers. They rarely looted segregated schools or attacked white churches. They did not march on corporate headquarters or break into office buildings, even though most northern downtowns were within easy reach."[60] In Dayton – outside of clashes with the police – many blacks directed their anger at the white shopkeepers who barred them from jobs and took advantage of their community. One black Westside resident stated: "You should see what they [whites] sell to Negroes, it is not fit for dogs to eat" in addition to how white business owners refused to hire local black residents.[61] At the same time, many rioters purposefully placed signs which read "soul brother" in front of white businesses which respected the black community. Although rioters directed their anger at police and shopkeepers, newspapers helped to solidify fears whites may have had about blacks.

Despite the fact that black rioters in the late-1960s more often than not only targeted police and shopkeepers, many whites feared for the destruction of their neighborhoods and personal safety.[62] A *Dayton Daily News* article headlined "IN W. THIRD ST. ALLEY: 'Nice,

---

[59] Ibid, 138.
[60] Sugrue, *Sweet Land of Liberty*, 334.
[61] *The Plain Dealer* (Cleveland, OH) Sep. 3, 1966. from The Dayton Urban League, "Urban League Records," 1943-1968, MS-38, Wright State University archives, Fairborn, Ohio.
[62] Sugrue, *Sweet Land of Liberty*, 327.

Gentle Old Man' Beaten by Youths."[63] News reports also heavily focused on specific instances of attacks against white people. Lester Kroogler testified to *Dayton Daily News*:

> When the light changed, I started to move and a brick came through the right side and hit me right here [pointing to his jaw], and bounced over and struck me on the arm. Boy he really heaved it. They were just a bunch of teenagers… just teenagers. But I wasn't going to stop. I just kept creeping along and took the trailer right into the terminal. If I didn't they would have killed me.[64]

The Journal Herald reported that Oakwood and Kettering police departments could assure suburbanites that they were "prepared" to protect their suburbs with "every available man on duty."[65]

The news coverage of rioters attacking whites helped cause some whites to take defensive measures. In his book *Blood in the Streets*, former police officer Daniel L. Baker recalls how "Carloads of white youths became vigilantes and scoured for blacks who might cross the river. Some adults who openly brandished shotguns, rifles and handguns on the streets were arrested."[66] Furthermore, officer Baker remarks that some whites feared black rioters spilling into their communities via public transportation.

> Cities and townships that surrounded Dayton took action to seal their borders. White upscale cities like Oakwood and Kettering made sure the "colored problem" did not spill over into their area. Roadblocks were set up and heavily staffed with armed officers who checked all cars that contained Negros. A few yellow and black City Transit buses that ran the routes were checked when they entered suburban enclaves.[67]

Despite the reports of white Daytonians being attacked, no black rioters entered into white communities during the Dayton Riot of 1966.

---

[63] The Dayton Urban League, "Nice, Gentle Old Man Beaten by Youths," *Dayton Daily News*, "Urban League Records," 1943-1968, MS-38, Wright State University archives, Fairborn, Ohio.
[64] "Rocks, Bricks Injure Many," *Dayton Daily News* (Dayton, OH) Sep. 2, 1966.
[65] "Two Suburbs at the Ready," *The Journal Herald* (Dayton, OH) Sep. 2, 1966.
[66] Baker and Nalls, *Blood in the Streets*,93.
[67] Ibid. 69.

Following the Dayton Riot of 1966, many white Daytonians saw the riots as separate and unrelated to the history of suburbia, attributing it to the coordinated efforts of Black Power activists. One white woman after stated: "What a terrible thing to have happen in Dayton! …I just can't believe the shooting was done by Dayton people! It looks to me like it was planned, by outsiders."[68] The destruction and looting on the Westside not only scared many whites, but reinforced notions some whites held about black culture and justified their reasons for living in suburbia. Two months after the initial riot, a *Dayton Daily News* reporter wrote that the black Westside resident "does not know how to make use of the freedom he has. He makes many mis-steps, stumbles often, experiences great difficulty in achievement. He feels somehow, he is not quite to blame for his troubles. Like all human beings, he seeks to place the burden elsewhere."[69] Another one white reporter sarcastically wrote: "BUT THE ROOT cause of urban unrest, everyone knows, is unemployment and its obviously antidote is to create jobs for men too ignorant and untrained to respond to opportunities offered in the want ad columns."[70] A *Dayton Express* journalist reported: "One day soon, I hope the Negro will wake up to realize that the enemy is himself. That he can now divert his energies from striking out at the white world and start rectifying his own shortcomings that definitely are within his ability to rectify."[71]

The greatest consequence of the Dayton Riot of 1966 was further abandonment of the central business district by the middle-class. In reference to increased insurance rates after the

---

[68] Mary Esther Ritchey, A Descriptive Study of the Civil Disturbance in Dayton, Ohio, September 1, 1966, in the Context of its Local and National Setting (Master's thesis, The Ohio State University, 1967), 161-162.
[69] "Vast Majority of Negroes Disapprove of Rowdiness," *Dayton Daily News*, Sep. 4, 1966.
[70] "Underemployment Big Cause of Current Urban Unrest," *Dayton Daily News* (Dayton, OH), Aug. 8, 1961.
[71] Mary Esther Ritchey, A Descriptive Study of the Civil Disturbance in Dayton, Ohio, September 1, 1966, in the Context of its Local and National Setting (Master's thesis, The Ohio State University, 1967), 161-162.

riot, a president of one Dayton manufacturing firm said: "Anyone that isn't thinking that rates won't go up is crazy. You don't even have to be smart to figure that out."[72] Furthermore, newspapers reported that for each day of rioting, the State of Ohio used $10,000 worth of Ohio taxpayer dollars to fund the National Guard while the City of Dayton used $4,500 worth of local taxpayer dollars.[73] This helped encourage many businesses and residents to move to suburbia, where their properties would be better protected and they would not pay taxes that they believed would contribute to urban riots.

During the first half of the twentieth century, restrictive covenants, discriminatory New Deal housing policies, as well as racial steering segregated Dayton. The construction of Interstate 75 displaced black Westside residents and relocated jobs to the suburban periphery, making it harder for low-income minorities to find jobs. Despite the reality that these factors led to the Dayton Riot of 1966, many white Daytonians viewed the riots as a result of coordinated efforts by black radicals to destroy the Dayton community. The fact that many white Daytonians did not view the riots as correlated with the history of segregation, unemployment, police brutality, and urban renewal, helped cause them to view the socioeconomic conditions and rioting on the Westside as a result of character flaws and poor housing decisions. Furthermore, many whites viewed all blacks as living on the Westside and involved with the riots, despite the fact that a high percentage of Dayton area blacks lived in Jefferson Township and not on the inner-Westside. The Dayton Riot of 1966 stigmatized Dayton's urban core as being a place filled with dangerous criminals, helping to cause whites and businesses to relocate to suburbia. Additionally, after the nationwide urban riots during the 1960s, many suburban communities like

---

[72] "Rioting: How Has It Affect…," *The Journal Herald*,
[73] "Cost Of Troops $15,000 A Day," *Dayton Daily News*, Sep. 4, 1966.

Beavercreek fought for incorporation in order to control their tax base, attract businesses, and subsidize public schools. As a result of mass-suburban – whether deliberate or not – has been the migration of the middle-class tax base from the urban core, while making it more difficult for low-income urbanites to reach suburban jobs often inaccessible by public transportation.

Part III

From 2010 through 2013, the Beavercreek City Council argued it was protecting the interest of its community by barring public transportation, due to concerns over public safety. Many suburban residents argued that public transportation did not belong in their community, as if its natural place was only in cities, and cited racially coded concerns over public safety. While the Beavercreek City Council believed it was objectively protecting the suburb's interests, the busing controversy brought to light how the fears many whites have of Dayton's Westside continues to perpetuate inequalities. The busing controversy grew out of a longer history of white suburbanites trying to protect what they saw as their self-interest.

Beavercreek's segregationist history began with its campaign for incorporation in the late-twentieth century. Between 1964 and 1980, the Committee of Eleven – a group of local property owners and businesses in Beavercreek Committee of Eleven – fought for incorporation in order to preserve lower taxes, avoid school desegregation, and remain safe from urban rioters. In 1986, the opening of Interstate 675 East in 1986 helped cause the construction of The Mall at Fairfield Commons near the interstate corridor. Due to the fact that many whites complained about black youth traveling by public transportation and causing trouble at Dayton Mall, the City of Beavercreek never brought public transportation to their new mall. As jobs increasingly left the urban core for The Mall at Fairfield Commons, urbanites had to trek 1.5 miles over I-675 from Fairborn to reach the mall. In 2011, Advocates for Basic Legal Equity, Inc. (ABLE) accused the Beavercreek City Council of violating Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, by barring a minority-majority ridership from using RTA services along federally funded highways in Beavercreek. The FHWA threated to halt funding to Beavercreek because their refusal prevented RTA's ridership from reaching the mall along federally funded highways, forcing the

City of Beavercreek to install the bus stops in 2014. Whether or not Beavercreek residents intended to deliberately discriminate against urban minorities, their efforts to separate their wealth and resources from the rest of the Dayton Metropolitan Area have arisen out of a belief that their only solution to urban problems was segregation.

After the Second World War, the sparsely inhabited farmland around Wright-Patterson Air Force Base began to develop into the suburbs of Fairborn and Beavercreek. When the City of Fairborn incorporated in 1950, it had a population around 12,000, which tripled by 1970.[1] One factor around the growth of Fairborn was the investments made by the United States Air Force at WPAFB, including the 1956 plan to relocate USAF Air Research and Development Command from Baltimore, Maryland to Fairborn in addition to constructing a $6 million building.[2] The demographics of Fairborn were primarily working-class, in addition to a significant black population relative to most peripheral communities during the Postwar Era. In her 1956 Master's thesis *A History of Fairborn, Ohio*, Mary P. Poole describes the suburb's dwellings as "attractive, modest single dwellings through multiple unit developments such as Hebble Homes and Krumm Plat to more pretentious homes"[3] Fairborn had a variety of dwellings as a result of the varied of economic statuses of employees at WPAFB.

By 1950, Beavercreek Township had a population of 5,327 residents which increased to 16,680 by 1960.[4] By the early-1960s, Beavercreek Township homes consisted almost entirely of

---

[1] Mary Parker Poole, "A History of Fairborn, Ohio" (Master's thesis, Miami University, 1956), 114 and 126.
[2] Ibid, 126.
[3] Ibid, 126.
[4] The Graduate Class of Urban Planning, "Survey report, Beavercreek Township, Ohio 1962," (Survey report, OhioLink, Miami University, 1962).

single-family units, reflective of its more affluent strata. A 1962 report from Miami University stated:

> The predominate type of dwelling in the township is the single family dwelling. These were previously farm houses, but now the residential development is the primary housing form. Houses in these suburban communities are of frame construction and often have a brick veneer on ½ acre lots. Throughout the township yards and houses are well maintained and kept in a neat and clean fashion. The general feeling of prosperity exists throughout the township… almost all the homes are single-story, ranch-type buildings of frame construction and brick veneer.[5]

The majority of the township's residents in the 1960s were recent white migrants, and 60 percent of them had only lived in the community for less than 5 years.[6] By 1962, only 32 percent of Beavercreek Township residents worked in Dayton and only 28 percent shopped in the central city.[7] Moreover, 58 percent of Beavercreek Township residents surveyed by the Committee of Eleven believed the "rural character" of Beavercreek was its best advantage, with 63 percent of residents planning on buying or building a new home in the community.[8]

On August 21, 1964, Fairborn announced its intentions to annex 6,022 acres of Beavercreek Township, which would have more than double the 3,543 acre city at the time.[9] Governed by a Township Trustee, Beavercreek Township did not have same legislative rights as an incorporated municipality, making it vulnerable to annexation. There were 31,300 acres in Beavercreek Township in 1962, less than 30 percent of which was developed, making it an enticing annexation plan for Fairborn as they needed more land for the newly opening Wright

---

[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Ibid.
[8] Ibid.
[9] The Committee of Eleven, 1956-1980, MS-112, Series I: Administration, boxes 1-3, "Fairborn proposes annex of Beavercreek twp. area," Wright State University archives, Fairborn, Ohio.

State University.[10] On August 27, 1964 a group of "community leaders and representatives of organizations" responded to Fairborn's proposal by forming the Committee of Eleven.[11] According to the committee: "The threat of annexation to Fairborn to the wealthier northern part of Beavercreek in 1964 triggered the current petition to incorporate the entire township."[12] It would be the middle-class tax base of the unincorporated township which Fairborn and Beavercreek fought over.

The primary objectives of the Committee of Eleven were to preserve low tax rates by attracting businesses, zoning out public housing and public transportation to protect urban rioting, and to maintaining racially segregated public schools. Historian Robert O. Self argues the unification of white suburbanites around taxation issues was a common characteristic of suburbs across the country after the Second World War:

> They were almost universally middle-class professionals, industrialists, modest landholders, and merchants, men and women who had smaller, though no less real, financial stakes in incorporation… they were diverse in class background and place of origin, but the structure of the housing markets into which they entered in the postwar decades would begin to give them a common identity, to shape for them a set of concerns and interests that would unite more than divide them.[13]

The Committee of Eleven embodied this tradition in the Dayton area and rallied support for incorporation mainly from local elites as well as middle-income residents. Beavercreek Township, like other American suburbs, attracted business in an effort to offset taxes in the community and subsidize city services and public schools. The 1962 report from Miami

---

[10] The Committee of Eleven, "Beavercreek Committee of Eleven, Inc. Records," 1956-1980, MS-112, Series I: Administration, boxes 1-3, "Who What Why: Chapter 1," Wright State University archives, Fairborn, Ohio.
[11] Ibid.
[12] The Committee of Eleven, "Who What Why: Chapter 1."
[13] Robert O. Self, *American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland* (Princeton University Press, 2003), 98.

University states that "it was the opinion of those interviewed at nearly all the industries that the development of the community as a completely residential area without the addition of new industry to help carry the increasing tax burden would force their withdrawal from the township."[14] The Committee of Eleven argued:

> Business and industry over the past century have located mostly where they can deal with a single authoritative type of government. Any community that can attract business and industry must have "good zoning," a fair tax rate, good schools and public services, libraries, cultural centers, etc. A Beavercreek with a larger proportion of its tax duplicate comprised of business and industry would find its "homes" less burdened for school purposes.[15]

Additionally, Harry Hammond – one of the presidents of the committee – contended that Fairborn's annexation proposal "would provide an estimated $10,000 in tax revenue to Fairborn" and "that such items such as street surface maintenance and police protection would more than consume this amount" increasing taxes in Beavercreek.[16] In 1967, 48.2 percent of Beavercreek Township residents supported bringing industry in order to enlarge their tax base.[17]

Many suburbanites wanted to incorporate not only to preserve low taxes and their standard of living, but also because they feared urban problems would enter their communities through annexation. In a brochure widely circulated throughout Beavercreek in the 1970s, the Committee of Eleven writes that "Dayton's problems are legion and right now and they seem insurmountable… it seems unlikely, however, that Dayton's problems will be solved by the

---

[14] The Graduate Class of Urban Planning, "Survey report, Beavercreek Township, Ohio 1962"
[15] "Beavercreek Committee of Eleven, Inc. Records," 1956-1980, MS-112, Series I: Administration, boxes 1-3, "Beavercreek Incorporation: What is it all about?," Wright State University archives, Fairborn, Ohio.
[16] The Committee of Eleven, "Beavercreek Committee of Eleven, Inc. Records," 1956-1980, MS-112, Series I: Administration, boxes 1-3, "Name Group to Study Beaver Incorporation," Wright State University archives, Fairborn, Ohio.
[17] The Committee of Eleven, "Beavercreek Committee of Eleven, Inc. Records," 1956-1980, MS-112, Series I: Administration, boxes 1-3, "Community Attitude survey Beavercreek township" Wright State University archives, Fairborn, Ohio.

annexation of additional territories. More likely, such annexation would simply spread Dayton's problems over a wider area and engulf a larger number of people."[18] To some suburbanites, Dayton's problems seemed "insurmountable" and many Beavercreek residents believed home-rule was the only method of preventing problems associated with cities from entering their community. The Committee of Eleven argued that through incorporation, Beavercreek could choose how to zone their community to their liking, specifically in regard to the types of dwellings and transportation.[19] For example, a survey found 71.2 percent of Beavercreek residents wanted multi-family housing zoned out of their community if the township were to incorporate.[20]

By the early-1970s, Dayton-based civil rights organization concluded that the best way to alleviate the socioeconomic conditions on the Westside and to prevent future rioting was to desegregate Dayton Public Schools. Although the Ohio General Assembly had adopted a resolution in 1887 requiring Ohio educational regulations to apply to all children regardless of race, Dayton Public Schools remained segregated due to neighborhood schools.[21] In theory, neighborhood schools do not segregate populations, rather they follow neighborhood boundaries for convenience; but due to the history of residential segregation in Dayton, public schools remained segregated because blacks and whites lived in different neighborhoods. Between 1940 and 1963, the percentage of northern whites who supported school integration increased from 40 percent to 75 percent.[22] Yet, because northern whites did not see themselves as southern

---

[18] The Committee of Eleven, "Beavercreek Incorporation: What is it all about?"
[19] Ibid.
[20] The Committee of Eleven, "Community Attitude survey Beavercreek township."
[21] Watras, "The Racial Desegregation of Dayton, Ohio, Public Schools, 1966-2008," 93.
[22] Sugrue, *Sweet Land of Liberty*, 465.

segregationists, northern suburbanites argued that they simply choose the best educational options for their children, rather than having avoided integration.[23] Sugrue writes:

> Just as school districts had contended that they were not legally culpable for "de facto" segregation, so too did many white parents argue that it was not their fault that schools remained sharply divided by race… they were not "southern style" bigots; they exercised their freedom of choice to select the best schooling options for their children. Blacks were left out either because of their personal, behavioral deficiencies or because of their own "free choice" to live in black neighborhoods. In this version of events, the whole postwar history of residential segregation vanished.[24]

This ideology allowed Dayton Public Schools to remain segregated through neighborhood schools, due to the fact that the city already segregated blacks and whites along the Great Miami River. Joseph Watras writes "When the [Dayton] school board decided to build schools to serve special neighborhoods, it created segregated schools. Further, as the racial composition of neighborhoods changed, the board maintained segregation."[25]

On April 18, 1972, attorneys from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) filed *Brinkman v. Gilligan*, asking for a metropolitan-wide school desegregation plan. According to Watras: "This request upset parents in the surrounding towns of Oakwood and Kettering who attended school board meetings to complain about the possibility of their children going to Dayton's schools."[26] It was this metropolitan desegregation plan which Beavercreek feared would ruin the quality of their child's education. Beavercreek Township Schools – which grew by 500 students per year from the late-1950s to the early-1960s – functioned as part of the Greene County Public Schools, with three elementary schools, a middle school, and a high school. Moreover, 97 percent of Beavercreek Township students relied on

---

[23] Ibid, 465-466.
[24] Ibid, 465-466.
[25] Watras, "The Racial Desegregation of Dayton, Ohio, Public Schools, 1966-2008," 93.
[26] Ibid, 103.

school bus transportation, which made it easy for desegregationist's to argue in favor of busing the growing suburban student population to Dayton Public Schools.[27] The Committee of Eleven stated: "Many parents of school-age children are completely turned off by the prospect of radical changes in their children's education. Beavercreek has a fine school system and there is small chance that it would be improved by piece-meal annexations to other school districts."[28]

In 1976, US Supreme Court ruled in *Brinkman v. Gilligan* that unless NAACP attorneys could prove de jure segregation occurred in Dayton, Dayton suburbs were not required to participate in school desegregation.[29] The lawsuit resulted in a mandated busing program strictly within the City of Dayton, busing black children to the eastside and white children to the Westside.[30] The Department of Justice Civil Rights Division considered Dayton's school desegregation programs to be one of the most successful in the United States, with no racial violence and high student retention rates.[31] However, despite the success of the busing program, it did not involve the suburbs who had the wealth for better educational resources.

While public schools were important, other factors caused many white Daytonians to move to the suburbs, such as the conveniences granted through homeownership as well as racially segregated neighborhoods. In 1971, the Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission surveyed Miami Valley residents about their housing and residential preferences and reported: "Almost all the interviewees indicated that, if given the choice, they would prefer a single-family dwelling to an apartment. This strong yearning to live in their own home was associated with the

[27] The Graduate Class of Urban Planning, "Survey report, Beavercreek Township, Ohio 1962"
[28] The Committee of Eleven, "Beavercreek Incorporation: What is it all about?"
[29] Ibid, 103.
[30] Ibid, 104.
[31] Ibid, 104.

desire for more personal freedom than they felt was possible in the average apartment life."[32] Furthermore, the MVRPC concluded that in 1971, only 40 percent of whites in the Miami Valley Region as compared to 81 percent of blacks were willing to live in racially integrated neighborhoods.[33]

After sixteen years of the Committee of Eleven fighting legal battles, on January 11, 1980, they established the Village of Beavercreek; thirty days after which became the City of Beavercreek.[34] The suburb grew quickly after its incorporation, increasing from 31,589 to 45,193 residents between 1980 and 2010.[35] In 2017, Beavercreek is on the cusp of 50,000 residents.[36] Although US-35 has extended through Beavercreek Township since the 1930s, the completion of I-675 through Beavercreek in 1987 stimulated suburban development along the interstate corridor, adversely disadvantaging Dayton furthering businesses and jobs from the urban core. Mark S. Cundiff saw this process unfold and argued in his 1983 Master's thesis *The Impact of Beltways on Metropolitan Areas* that highway construction would hurt low-income urban residents who needed jobs while allowing suburbs to build their tax bases: "Beltways and other infrastructure investments in most instances confer no benefits on the disadvantaged and low-income residents, many of whom live in central cities. Suburban beltways, by drawing activity out of the central cities, affect their tax base and the ability of the city to deliver needed

---

[32] Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission, "Directions for the Suburbs: Expanding Low and Moderate Income Housing Opportunities in the Dayton, Ohio Region (Report, 1971), 42.
[33] Ibid, 42.
[34] "Goodbye village; hello to Ohio's 234th city," *Beavercreek Daily News*, Jan. 12, 1980.
[35] "Data USA: Search, Map, Compare, and Download US Data," *Data USA*, www.datausa.io
[36] *Free To Ride*, directed by Mathew Martin.

social services to those who need them the most."[37] This process unfolded outside Dayton after the opening of I-675 in 1986. The highway helped eastern suburbs to develop rapidly as Wright State University, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, and The Mall at Fairfield Commons continued to attract middle-class residents from the urban core. The completion of I-675 established a north-south half-loop between I-70 and US-35 which provided easy transportation around Dayton for automobile owners. At the same time, I-675 created a physical border between Fairborn and Beavercreek, isolating the working-class suburb of Fairborn from Beavercreek.

In 1993, as a direct result of the opening of I-675, The Mall at Fairfield Commons opened – adjacent to WSU on the opposite side of I-675 – in Beavercreek. These two suburban developments attracted students and consumers from across the Miami Valley region. This event mirrored similar processes across the United States in this period. Historian Jon C. Teaford writes: "The proliferating malls were not just convenient supplements to the dominant downtown retailers. They were new downtowns that were displacing the old central business districts as the focus of metropolitan shopping. Shoppers were heading downtown less often and instead going to the mall."[38] The new mall became a Beavercreek's "downtown," as over 58 percent of Beavercreek residents traveled to Dayton for no other reason than to buy consumer goods unavailable in Beavercreek.[39]

These "new downtowns," however, offered more than accessibility. They also marketed themselves as "safe spaces" free of urban problems and black people. Teaford writes:

---

[37] Mark Stephen Cundiff, "The Impact of Beltways on Metropolitan Areas: The Interstate 675-Dayton Metropolitan Area Case Study" (Master's thesis, Wright State University, 1983), 38-39.
[38] Jon C. Teaford, *The Metropolitan Revolution: The Rise of Post-Urban America* (New York City, NY: Columbia University Press, 2006), 89.
[39] The Committee of Eleven, "Community Attitude survey Beavercreek township."

"Compared with downtown, the malls offered a socially homogeneous environment where suburbanites could ship among people like themselves without confronting the sidewalk panhandlers or 'undesirable' characters that could be found in the urban core."[40] By the early-1990s, some white suburbanites complained about black youths traveling by public transportation from the Westside and shopping at the Dayton Mall. One *Dayton Daily News* op-ed report states: "It's about time that some rules were implemented at the Dayton Mall. The groups of teenagers were taking over. Now maybe families can start shopping together again and feel safe."[41] Most of these youths were black and came from the RTA hub on 4 South Main Street, which was located in the heart of downtown. In 1990, general manager of the Salem Mall Ron Bergman stated: "I think it [decline of the Salem Mall] is because the demographics of our area are changing. People unfairly attribute minorities to crime."[42]

By the late-2000s, *Dayton Daily News* had dubbed the Greater Dayton Regional Transit Authority's downtown headquarter as the "Corner of Chaos"[43] due to the "fights, robberies, drug sales, and open-air drug use" occurring between youth.[44] Between 2000 and 2014, the location of RTA's headquarters at the downtown block of Third and Main Streets led in the number of reported crime incidents within the City of Dayton.[45] In 2010, the DPD and the RTA teamed up on a project known as "Reclaiming the Corner of Chaos," in which they tried to end the stigma

---

[40] Teaford, *The Metropolitan* Revolution, 89.
[41] "Speak Up: Brief Comments," *Dayton Daily News*, Aug. 7, 2013.
[42] "Malls Still 1st on Shopping List Downtown's Improving Crime Record has yet to Impress Shoppers," *Dayton Daily News*, Apr. 15, 1990. http://nl.newsbank.com/nl-search/we/Archives?p_action=doc&p_docid=0F4FB067C73A316A&p_docnum=1
[43] "Corner no longer known for chaos," *Dayton Daily News*, Nov. 27, 2015.
[44] "Reclaiming the Corner of Chaos," (Greater Dayton Regional Transit Authority and Dayton Police Department, Dayton, Ohio, 2010) www.popcenter.org/library/awards/goldstein/2010/10-20(F).pdf
[45] Ibid.

around public transportation in Dayton. According to this report: "The RTA problem remained persistent, with extensive negative media coverage… the problems began to harm Dayton's reputation and future economic development. Many riders felt the hub was unsafe or only moderately safe."[46] Despite the report's efforts to use statistical crime data and evidence to prove to Daytonians that riding public transportation is safe, reports about the Corner of Chaos suggested that criminals made bus stops unsafe.

When the RTA requested to construct bus stops at The Mall at Fairfield Commons, the Beavercreek City Council already associated the RTA with the problems at the Dayton Mall. Until 2014, the closest bus stop for Daytonians working at The Mall at Fairfield Commons was at WSU, causing the majority-minority RTA ridership commuting to work to have to cross a six-lane overpass above the interstate with no pedestrian walkways to reach Beavercreek. Despite the effects lack of public transportation had on minorities, many suburbanites still opposed bus stops. One suburbanite stated to the Dayton Daily News: Why should Beavercreek invite problems? For the record, it's undeniable that bus stops adjacent to large shopping areas bring large problems. Many remember the slow death of the Salem Mall, the Third and Main Street combat zone, and the chaos created at the Dayton Mall in the near past due to unruly groups arriving on RTA buses."[47]

In an effort to provide public transportation from Dayton's Westside to Beavercreek, in March of 2010 the RTA requested the installation of six bus stops along Pentagon Boulevard at The Mall at Fairfield Commons. The Beavercreek City Council denied the RTA's request on three occasions, stating concerns over design, expenses, and public safety.

---

[46] Ibid.

[47] "More of Your Views on Bus Stops," *Dayton Daily News*, Apr. 8, 2011. nl.newsbank.com/nl-search/we/Archives?p_action=doc&p_docid=1367F318280CB750&p_docnum=22

On August 10, 2011, Leaders for Equality & Action in Dayton – a Dayton-based civil rights organization – responded to the continual denial of RTA's proposal by filling allegations against the City of Beavercreek to the Federal Highway Administration Office of Civil Rights:

> [The] inability of African American job seekers to obtain transportation to the Beavercreek area has been a major barrier to employment… the City of Beavercreek's criteria and methods for deciding whether to allow RTA transit stops in Beavercreek, which resulted in the denial of the application for those stops had the effect of subjecting African Americans, who disproportionately ride transit, to discrimination.[48]

As a direct result of LEAD's allegations, the FHWA Office of Civil Rights began an investigation into the legality of Beavercreek's objection on February 22, 2012. The main argument of the FHWA Office of Civil Rights derived from Section 601 of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which states: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."[49] The City of Beavercreek risked losing $10.7 million in FHWA funding.[50]

Since the federal government subsidized highway construction, the FHWA determined that Beavercreek City Council used "facially neutral" excuses to keep public transportation out of their suburb, which disproportionately affected RTA ridership. 73 percent of RTA's ridership was nonwhite, of which 64 percent of whom are black, with only 27 of RTA ridership being white.[51] A survey of Beavercreek residents found that 90 percent were against the installation of

---

[48] Federal Highway Administration to Michael Cornell, Stanley A. Hirtle, and Ellis Jacobs, June 23, 2013, (report by the FHWA to ABLE) www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/ODI/EqualOpportunity/Title%20VI/FHWA%20Response%20-%20Beavercreek_OH_June%202013%20(2).pdf, 4.
[49] Ibid, 5.
[50] "RTA route to Beavercreek mall begins Sunday," *Dayton Daily News*, Jan. 11, 2014. http://nl.newsbank.com/nl-search/we/Archives?p_action=doc&p_docid=14B44AC784CBB8E0&p_docnum=4
[51] Federal Highway Administration, (report by the FHWA to ABLE), 10.

bus stops, primarily over safety concerns.[52] One Beavercreek councilwoman stated "It's hard for me to understand those who suggest that Beavercreek citizens have no good or reasonable basis for their concerns, given all of the issues that have been at the Salem mall, the Dayton mall, and downtown Dayton." Councilmembers made "coded" requests for requirements like "climate controlled" bus stops and hi-tech security cameras for bus stops used only six times a day.[53] According to attorney Ellis Jacobs at LEAD: "Even though the language being used to turn down the buses was very coded, it was all about crime."[54] The FHWA threatened to cut all transportation funding to the City of Beavercreek due to the desperate impact their policies had on RTA's majority-minority ridership, which forced Beavercreek City Council to open bus stops on Pentagon Boulevard in January of 2014.[55]

Tensions surrounding this decision spilled over into a local case of police misconduct that garnered national attention. On August 5, 2014, white police officer Sean Williams shot and killed John Crawford III – a 22-year-old black man and resident of Fairborn – at the Walmart at The Mall at Fairfield Commons.[56] This shooting sheds light on some of the associations the Beavercreek City Council had between blacks, public transportation, and crime. The 9-1-1 caller reported Crawford was holding an "assault rifle" and was aiming it at shoppers. However, Walmart surveillance footage showed no evidence of any these actions, rather Crawford was

---

[52] Ibid, 9.
[53] *Free To Ride*, directed by Mathew Martin.
[54] Ibid.
[55] Ellis Jacobs, "Let the people ride: Bringing buses to Beavercreek and revitalizing civil rights enforcement," *Ohio State Bar Association*, www.ohiobar.org/NewsAndPublications/OhioLawyer/Pages/Let-the-people-ride-Bringing-buses-to-Beavercreek-and-revitalizing-civil-rights-enforcement.aspx
[56] Mark Gokavi, "Cops in Walmart Shooting may be deposed before DOJ probe is done," *Dayton Daily News* (Dayton, OH), Aug. 14, 2016. www.daytondailynews.com/news/crime--law/cops-walmart-shooting-may-deposed-before-doj-probe-done/No1Di4jL5t563zSkhVq9PM/

holding a BB gun.[57] The Beavercreek Police Department spent $430,000 in legal defenses for the two involved officers, rather than paying a settlement to the victim's family.[58] In the end, the Beavercreek Police Department placed Officer Williams on administrative leave, eventually reinstating his rights on July 11, 2017 as the US Department of Justice announced it would not seek federal charges.[59]

Although separated by a half century, the Committee of Eleven's campaign for municipal incorporation and Beavercreek City Council's efforts to bar public transportation reveal notions many suburbanites have held about cities and public transportation. From 1964 until 1980, the Committee of Eleven campaigned to protect the unincorporated township from annexation by working-class Fairborn or having their children bussed to Dayton Public Schools. The Committee of Eleven fought to attract businesses in order to help subsidize suburban tax rates. In a similar manner, the Beavercreek City Council continual denial of RTA bus stops at The Mall at Fairfield Commons was done in an effort to preserve in the mall's middle-class ambiance the fear that urbanites would bring crime or blight. These assumptions often came from the stigmatization developed during the Dayton Riot of 1966, that black people will only come into your community to cause trouble. More importantly, many suburbanites have attributed the conditions on Dayton's Westside to personal faults, rather than the legacy of housing

---

[57] "Judge: Probable cause to prosecute 911 caller in Beavercreek Walmart shooting," *WLWT5* (Cincinnati, OH) Apr. 6, 2016. www.wlwt.com/article/judge-probable-cause-to-prosecute-911-caller-in-beavercreek-walmart-shooting/3564060

[58] "Ohio city spends $430K to defend officers in Walmart shooting," *NBC4i WCMH-TV Columbus by Associated Press* (Columbus, OH) Apr. 18, 2017. www.nbc4i.com/2017/04/18/ohio-city-spends-430k-to-defend-officers-in-wal-mart-shooting/

[59] Mark Gokavi, "Beavercreek officer who shot John Crawford III back on 'full duty'," *Dayton Daily News* (Dayton, OH) Jul. 18, 2017. www.daytondailynews.com/news/crime--law/beavercreek-officer-who-shot-john-crawford-iii-back-full-duty/4Mqm5kwqi3boJH1FF6r13K/

discrimination and high unemployment, which tends to force city residents to commute to the only available jobs in places such as Beavercreek.

Conclusion

When the Federal Highway Administration Office of Civil Rights ruled that Beavercreek City Council violated Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, it revealed some of the notions many Americans have held towards both suburbia, inner-cities, and public transportation. The fact that many Americans believe cities have always existed in their contemporary informs our understanding of the Beavercreek busing controversy in two ways. First: because many Americans view their suburbs as the result of "de facto segregation," they ignore the historical realities that the government supported suburbanization and helped make them racially exclusive. Their views often ignore the historical diversity of suburbs, housing, and transportation in the United States and view the contemporary urban landscape as having always existed. More importantly, this belief continues to cause many Americans to view the socioeconomic conditions of cities, such as on Dayton's Westside, as unrelated to the history of suburbanization. Second: the efforts of the Committee of Eleven and the Beavercreek City Council to protect their economic interests demonstrates that because many white suburbanites believe they have no historical connection to or obligation to the socioeconomic conditions on Dayton's Westside, it is their right to segregate themselves from those problems.

Many Daytonians believe that residents have always commuted to work along the city's 140 miles of freeway for an average of 20.6 minutes each day to jobs at Dayton's largest employers including Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and The Mall at Fairfield Commons.[1] However, in the early-nineteenth century, most Daytonians lived at their place of work or lived

[1] Miami Valley Regional Transit Authority, "A Summary of Going Places: An Integrated Land Use Vision for the Miami Valley Region," (Report) May 2015.

within a one mile walking distance of it. By the turn of the nineteenth century, the electric streetcar allowed Dayton's profiting industrialist to build mansions in Oakwood, only accessible by streetcar. Additionally, expensive mortgages and restrictive covenants made homeownership unattainable to most Daytonians.

It would not be until the New Deal and the advent of the automobile that allowed a mass-migration of the white middle-class from Dayton. The New Deal Era established the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Veteran's Administration, which brought affordable homeownership to middle-class Americans. However, because these federal agencies prioritized the construction of new suburban homes over the rehabilitation of older ones in urban cores, this effectively segregated blacks to the Dayton's older housing stock on the Westside. After the Second World War, as these federal agencies made suburban homeownership more affordable than urban ranting, Charles C. Huber mass-produced affordable homes for Daytonians in Huber Heights. Unlike Oakwood residents, who relied on public transportation which connected them to the central business district, the construction of I-70 and the affordability of the automobile moved business and industry to Huber Heights, economically abandoning the urban core.

During the Postwar Era, New Deal housing policies, the growth of the automobile, as well as deindustrialization in the urban core helped created the contemporary hyper-segregation in the Dayton Metropolitan Area. The Interstate Highway System helped promote the automobile as the primary means of transportation for suburbs which ended mass-transit in Dayton. Not only did urbanites lose funding for their primary means of transportation, but they often could not access jobs in suburbs without an automobile. Additionally, the construction of

I-75 for the purpose of suburban development came at the cost of destroying the black Westside and displacing hundreds of residents.

The inability of the Supporting Committee on Preventative Effort and Moving Ahead Together to alleviate the socioeconomic pressures on the Westside, due to their inter-organizational conflicts, helped turn many blacks to seek more radical solutions to segregation. Even though numerous factors contributed to the Dayton Riot of 1966, many whites blamed black leftists and the Black Power Movement for trying to destroy Dayton. Additionally, they often blamed it on the character flaws and housing choices of blacks, rather than deliberately racist housing and transportation policies. Many suburbanites feared these riots would spread to their communities and did not want to support a declining urban core. These beliefs ultimately pushed communities like Beavercreek Township to incorporate out of a misplaced sense of self-preservation.

While objectively the Committee of Eleven protected their business interests and public schools, their incorporation concentrated middle-class wealth in Beavercreek. They not only helped bar Dayton schoolchildren from the educational resources available from Beavercreek's tax base, but also helped push employment opportunities to The Mall at Fairfield Commons as Dayton deindustrialized. In the same way, while the Beavercreek City Council many have fought to keep public transportation out of their community for many reasons, the result had a significant impact on the RTA's minority-majority ridership.

The legacy of suburbanization in Dayton remains relevant today as Dayton continues to sprawl. In 1960 at 262,332 residents, with a white population at 78.1 percent white and a black population at 21.8 percent. However, since 1960, Dayton's population has declined to 141,368 residents, 51.6 percent of whom are white and 40.1 percent of whom are black. At the same

time, since 1990, Beavercreek's population 33,544 to almost 50,000. The trend of suburbanization in Dayton does not seem to be ending anytime soon, and suburbanites continue to fight to preserve their economic advantages as well as protect themselves from their fear of minorities. While it is not always blatant discrimination, the trend over the past 100 years has been whites benefiting from policies that not only create inequalities but promote fears and stereotypes about urban minorities.

Bibliography

"Bare Bias In Dayton Housing." *The Chicago Defender* (Chicago, IL), Dec. 22, 1956.

Baker, Daniel L., and Gwen Nalls, *Blood in the Streets: Racism, Riots and Murders in the Heartland of America*. Dayton, Ohio: Forensic Publications, LLC. 2014.

"Beavercreek Historical Society – Beavercreek, Ohio." *Beavercreek Historical Society*, www.beavercreekhistoricalsociety.org/wordpress/

Caulkins, Frank A. *Progressive Ohioans and New Deal Housing Programs in Dayton*. Professional Press, 2001.

"Changes in Minority Residential Patterns in Montgomery County: 1970-1980." Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission archives, Montgomery County Fair Housing Center, 1985.

"Housing Survey: City of Dayton (1934)." Dayton City Plan Board. Dayton Metro Library archives. Dayton, Ohio.

"Corner no longer known for chaos." *Dayton Daily News* (Dayton, OH) Nov. 27, 2015.

"Cost Of Troops $15,000 A Day." *Dayton Daily News* (Dayton, OH), Sep. 4, 1966.

Craig, Lois. "The Dayton Area's 'Fair Share' Housing Plan." *Magazine of Urban Life and Environment*, January/February 1972.

"Crowd Reaction Bolsters Wallace's Hopes for 1968." *The New York Times* (New York City, NY), Nov. 15, 1967.

"Data USA: Search, Map, Compare, and Download US Data." *Data USA*. www.datausa.io

Dayton City Plan Board, "Downtown Dayton Redevelopment Plan." OhioLink: Wright State University archives, 1961.

de Jong, Greta. *Invisible Enemy: The African American Freedom Struggle after 1965*. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

"Directions for the Suburbs: Expanding Low and Moderate Income Housing Opportunities in the Dayton, Ohio Region." Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission archives, Gruen Gruen + Associates, 1971.

"Drive Is Launched By City To End Housing Blight." *The Journal Herald* (Dayton, OH), Feb. 6, 1960.

Ewen, Elizabeth. *Picture Windows: How The Suburbs Happened*. New York City, NY: Basic Books, 2000.

"Experts Look At Negro Job Picture." *The Journal Herald* (Dayton, OH), Oct. 28, 1965.

Fairborn City Council and Fairborn Planning Commission. "Fairborn Development Plan." Report. OhioLink. Fairborn City Council. Fairborn, Ohio, 1969.

Federal Highway Administration to Michael Cornell, Stanley A. Hirtle, and Ellis Jacobs, June 23, 2013. www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/ODI/EqualOpportunity/Title%20VI/FHWA%20Response%20-%20Beavercreek_OH_June%202013%20(2).pdf

Free To Ride. Directed by Mathew Martin (2016; The Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity), Vimeo.

Gokavi, Mark. "Beavercreek officer who shot John Crawford III back on 'full duty'." *Dayton Daily News* (Dayton, OH) Jul. 18, 2017. www.daytondailynews.com/news/crime--law/beavercreek-officer-who-shot-john-crawford-iii-back-full-duty/4Mqm5kwqi3boJH1FF6r13K/

Gokavi, Mark. "Cops in Walmart Shooting may be deposed before DOJ probe is done." *Dayton Daily News* (Dayton, OH), Aug. 14, 2016. www.daytondailynews.com/news/crime--law/cops-walmart-shooting-may-deposed-before-doj-probe-done/No1Di4jL5t563zSkhVq9PM/

"Goodbye village; hello to Ohio's 234th city." *Beavercreek Daily News* (Beavercreek, OH), Jan. 12, 1980.

"History." *Greater Dayton Regional Transit Authority*. www.i-riderta.org/about-rta/history

"History of Huber Heights." *Huber Heights Chamber of Commerce*. www.huberheightschamber.com/community/history/

"Housing Riddle Finds Negroes 'In Middle'." *Dayton Daily News* (Dayton, OH), Sep. 25, 1961.

"Improvement Program in Dayton This Year to Cost $16,000,000." *The Wall Street Journal* (New York City, NY), Jan. 16, 1939.

Jackson, Kenneth T. *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States*. New York City, NY. Oxford University Press, 1985.

Jackson, Kenneth T. "Race, Ethnicity, and Real Estate Appraisal: The Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the Federal Housing Administration," *Journal of Urban History*, (1980).

Jacobs, Ellis. "Let the people ride: Bringing buses to Beavercreek and revitalizing civil rights enforcement," *Ohio State Bar Association*, www.ohiobar.org/NewsAndPublications/OhioLawyer/Pages/Let-the-people-ride-Bringing-buses-to-Beavercreek-and-revitalizing-civil-rights-enforcement.aspx

"Judge: Probable cause to prosecute 911 caller in Beavercreek Walmart shooting," *WLWT5* (Cincinnati, OH) Apr. 6, 2016. www.wlwt.com/article/judge-probable-cause-to-prosecute-911-caller-in-beavercreek-walmart-shooting/3564060

"Lynching Bee Is Proposed In Dayton Segregation Row." The Baltimore Afro-American (Baltimore, MD), Jul. 30, 1927.

"Malls Still 1st on Shopping List Downtown's Improving Crime Record has yet to Impress Shoppers," *Dayton Daily News*, Apr. 15, 1990. http://nl.newsbank.com/nl-search/we/Archives?p_action=doc&p_docid=0F4FB067C73A316A&p_docnum=1

"MAT-SCOPE Meeting Stormy." *The Journal Herald*, Jun. 13, 1967.

"Metro Report At A Glance." *The Journal Herald*, Nov. 2, 1959.

Miami Valley Regional Transit Authority. "A Summary of Going Places: An Integrated Land Use Vision for the Miami Valley Region." (Report) May 2015.

Miller, Kenneth David. "Transportation Revolution and the Development of Oakwood, Ohio, 1870-1930." Master's thesis, Wright State University, 1998.

"More of Your Views on Bus Stops." *Dayton Daily News*. Apr. 8, 2011.nl.newsbank.com/nl-search/we/Archives?p_action=doc&p_docid=1367F318280CB750&p_docnum=22

Morton, Marian. "Deferring Dreams: Racial and Religious Covenants in Shaker Heights, Cleveland Heights and East Cleveland, 1925 to 1970." teachingcleveland.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/02/deferring%20dreams%20marion%20morton.pdf

"National Cash Register Company." *Ohio History Connection*. www.ohiohistorycentral.org/w/National_Cash_Register_Company

National Housing Agency News Release, "Postwar Housing Survey of Consumer Demand in the Dayton Area (July 1945)," (September 29, 1945), Dayton Metro Library Genealogy Center.

"National Urban League Community Relations Project: Summary and recommendations of a study of the social and economic conditions of the Negro population of Dayton, Ohio, 1945." Kent State University archives, Schomburg Microfilm Series, Micro-35 E185 .S37x no.111.

"NCR Moves To Employ More Negroes." *The Journal Herald* (Dayton, OH) Nov. 30, 1965.

"Negro Housing Survey / [prepared by the Council of Social Agencies at the request of the Dayton Council for Defense]." 1942, 317.717 D276N, Dayton Metro Library archives, Dayton, Ohio.

"Oakwood Historical Society Newsletter: Winter 2011." *The Oakwood Historical Society*, (2011). www.oakwoodhistory.org/downloads/ohsnewswinter2011.pdf

"Ohio city spends $430K to defend officers in Walmart shooting." *NBC4i WCMH-TV Columbus by Associated Press* (Columbus, OH) Apr. 18, 2017. www.nbc4i.com/2017/04/18/ohio-city-spends-430k-to-defend-officers-in-wal-mart-shooting/

"Ohio Modern: Preserving Our Recent Past Statewide Historic Context." Gray & Pape, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio, 2010.

"Ohio Public Works Program." *The Wall Street Journal* (New York City, NY), Nov. 22, 1933.

Parker, Mary Poole. "A History of Fairborn, Ohio." Master's thesis, Miami University, 1956.

Powell, Lisa. "The Great Dayton Flood of 1913: 15 things to know about broken levees, rescue boats and lost lives." *Dayton Daily News* (Dayton, OH), Mar. 20, 2017. www.mydaytondailynews.com/news/the-great-dayton-flood-1913-things-know-about-broken-levees-rescue-boats-and-lost-lives/6MzhsTtAysABc4pFACBjpL/

"Reclaiming the Corner of Chaos." (Greater Dayton Regional Transit Authority and Dayton Police Department, Dayton, Ohio, 2010) www.popcenter.org/library/awards/goldstein/2010/10-20(F).pdf

"Report of Huge Grant For Rights Aid Denied." *The Washington Post* (Washington, DC), Sep. 27, 1963.

"Rioting: How Has It Affect…" *The Journal Herald*

Ritchey, Mary Esther. "A Descriptive Study of the Civil Disturbance in Dayton, Ohio, September 1, 1966, in the Context of its Local and National Setting." Master's thesis, The Ohio State University, 1967.

"Rocks, Bricks Injure Many." *Dayton Daily News* (Dayton, OH) Sep. 2, 1966.

Ronald, Bruce W., and Virginia Ronald. *Oakwood: The Far Hills*. Reflections Press, 1983.

Ronald, Bruce W., and Virginia. *The Lands Between the Miamis: A Bicentennial Celebration of the Dayton Area*. Landfall Press, 1996.

"RTA route to Beavercreek mall begins Sunday." *Dayton Daily News*. Jan. 11, 2014. http://nl.newsbank.com/nl-search/we/Archives?p_action=doc&p_docid=14B44AC784CBB8E0&p_docnum=4

Staley, Samuel R. "Dayton, Ohio: The Rise, Fall and Stagnation of a Former Industrial Juggernaut." (newgeography, 2008) www.newgeography.com/content/00153-dayton-ohio-the-rise-fall-and-stagnation-a-former-industrial-juggernaut

Stearns, Richard C. *Racial Content of FHA Underwriting Practices, 1934-1962*, University of Baltimore archives

"Speak Up: Brief Comments." *Dayton Daily News*, Aug. 7, 2013.

Sugrue, Thomas J. *Sweet Land of Liberty: The Forgotten Struggle for Civil Rights in the North*. New York City, NY. Random House, 2009.

Sweigart, Josh. "Lasting Scars, Part 2: Fifty years later, Dayton remains segregated," *Dayton Daily News* (Dayton, OH), Aug. 30, 2016. www.mydaytondailynews.com/news/lasting-scars-part-fifty-years-later-dayton-remains-segregated/n43hseF7clMWsXtdVODYMM/

Teaford, Jon C. *The Metropolitan Revolution: The Rise of Post-Urban America*. New York City, NY: Columbia University Press, 2006.

The City of Oakwood. *Oakwood: From Acorn to Oak Tree: A centennial Celebration 2008*. The City of Oakwood, 2008.

The Committee of Eleven. "Beavercreek Committee of Eleven, Inc. Records." 1956-1980, MS-112, Wright State University archives, Fairborn, Ohio.

The Dayton Urban League, "Urban League Records," 1943-1968, MS-38, Wright State University archives, Fairborn, Ohio.

The Graduate Class of Urban Planning. "Survey report, Beavercreek Township, Ohio 1962." (Survey report, OhioLink, Miami University, 1962).

"The Place to Live." 1915 Schantz Estate Brochure. Reprinted June 2006. The Oakwood Historical Society.

"Two Suburbs at the Ready." *The Journal Herald* (Dayton, OH) Sep. 2, 1966.

"Underemployment Big Cause of Current Urban Unrest." *Dayton Daily News* (Dayton, OH), Aug. 8, 1961.

United States Census Bureau. "Table 36. Ohio - Race and Hispanic Origin for Selected Large Cities and Other Places: Earliest Census to 1990." www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0076/OHtab.pdf

"Vast Majority of Negroes Disapprove of Rowdiness." *Dayton Daily News* (Dayton, OH), Sep. 4, 1966.

Watras, Joseph. "The Racial Desegregation of Dayton, Ohio, Public Schools, 1966-2008." *Ohio History*, no. 117 (2010).

Watras, Joseph. *Politics, Race, and Schools: Racial Integration, 1954-1994*. Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997.

Wright, Gwendolyn. *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America*. New York City, NY. Pantheon Books, 1981.

"$6,000,000 FHA Loans in Dayton." *The Wall Street Journal* (New York City, NY), Jul. 3, 1939.